OE FORM 6000, 2/69

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACC. NO. ED 032 448			
CH ACC. NO. AA 000 412	P.A.	PUBL. DATE 30 Sep 69	ISSUE RIEFEB70

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☒
ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☐ NO ☒
LEVEL OF AVAILABILITY I ☒ II ☐ III ☐

AUTHOR
Hearn, Norman Eugene

TITLE
Innovative Educational Programs: A Study of the Influence of Selected Variables Upon Their Continuation Following the Termination of Three-Year ESEA Title III Grants.

SOURCE CODE

INSTITUTION (SOURCE)

SP. AG. CODE

SPONSORING AGENCY

EDRS PRICE
1.50;17.15

CONTRACT NO.

GRANT NO.

REPORT NO.

BUREAU NO.

AVAILABILITY

JOURNAL CITATION

DESCRIPTIVE NOTE 341p.; Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the School of Education of The George Washington University in partial satisfaction of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Education.

DESCRIPTORS
*Innovation; *Educational Innovation; *Federal Aid; Educational Programs; Diffusion; Surveys; School Superintendents; Federal Programs; *Program Effectiveness; School Systems; Supplementary Education; Education Service Centers

IDENTIFIERS Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Title 3); ESEA Title 3; *Title 3 Grants

ABSTRACT
A study was made to determine the extent to which educational innovations developed through federally funded projects of Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act are continued and thus adopted by the local public school system or by other school systems in the United States. Information was obtained by a questionnaire survey of the school superintendents of the applicant school districts for the 330 operational projects which had been approved and funded by the U.S. Office of Education in fiscal year 1966 for a 3-year period. These projects were then analyzed according to selected variables--(1) the characteristics of the school systems in which the projects operate, (2) the personal characteristics of the superintendents, and (3) the properties or characteristics of the projects themselves--in order to determine which factors, if any, were associated with the continuation of Title III projects in local school districts. The survey yielded that 279 (84.5%) of the 330 projects in the survey were continued. Continuation was found to be associated with such project characteristics as cost and preparation of materials, such situational or system variables as wealth and community norms, and such superintendent characteristics as age and education. The average project was responsible for stimulating 20 similar new projects in other schools. The study findings were intended for use by granting institutions (federal, state, and private) in helping to refine the criteria used to review and evaluate proposals for innovative programs, and by school superintendents in aiding decision making regarding the installation of innovations. (JH)

ED 032 448

INNOVATIVE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS: A STUDY OF THE INFLUENCE OF SELECTED VARIABLES UPON THEIR CONTINUATION FOLLOWING THE TERMINATION OF THREE-YEAR ESEA TITLE III GRANTS

AA 000 412

September 30, 1969

Washington, D.C.

Norman Eugene Hearn

INNOVATIVE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS: A STUDY OF THE INFLUENCE OF SELECTED VARIABLES UPON THEIR CONTINUATION FOLLOWING THE TERMINATION OF THREE-YEAR ESEA TITLE III GRANTS

by

Norman Eugene Hearn

B.A. in American History, 1949, University of Michigan
M.A. in Education, 1951, University of Michigan

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the School of
Education of The George Washington University
in partial satisfaction of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education

September 30, 1969

Washington, D.C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Directed by Robert Edward Baker,
Professor of Education

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my wife, WINONA L. HEARN, for her understanding, patience, and self-sacrifice throughout the many years of my student educational career.

PREFACE

The topic of this study was selected because of the writer's growing concern with two major assumptions being made by significantly large numbers of educators and legislators regarding the effects of Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)--first, that following the termination of Title III grants, the new programs were not being continued by the school districts; and, second, that the effects of Title III could not be evaluated objectively because of its broad scope and emphasis upon innovation.

The first assumption, if valid, would have negated the value of the federal dollar, except as a temporary relief measure to local school budgets. (This view frequently has been expressed about educational foundation grants and demonstration programs, in general.)

If the second assumption were true, it would appear that the effectiveness of innovative programs could be determined only on a subjective basis, which would offer scant decision-making data for broader application or adoption by other school districts. The general attitude that Title III efforts could not effectively be evaluated was expressed in an official memorandum to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe

II,[1] which stated that:

> Title III is probably the most difficult activity to evaluate. The projects financed by it blanket every conceivable activity which has been undertaken in elementary and secondary schools and a number of inconceivable ones. In order to have an orderly evaluation one needs a model of human behavior. This is a mighty ambitious undertaking. Perhaps a decade from now we will get it.

This writer was of the opinion, therefore, that information was needed to test the validity of these two prevailing views. However, the writer also was convinced that the key evaluative question had not been asked; that is: to what extent and for what reasons were Title III programs being discontinued or continued after the federal grant period ended? It was in this spirit of concern and inquiry that this study was undertaken.

In his position as Chief of the Program Analysis and Dissemination Branch in the USOE Division administering the grants, the writer had been involved in the formulation of many of the major policy decisions, and in the development of the operational guidelines for this Title. He, therefore, had firsthand knowledge of the operation of the Title III program. Thus, some information in the study necessarily came from his personal files and from his recollection of the events.

Memorandum from Joseph Froomkin, U.S. Assistant Commissioner of Education, Program Planning and Evaluation, Washington, D.C., May 14, 1968.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The subject of this study attracted keen interest among educators and organizations whose advice and help was sought and received. The writer is particularly indebted to Dr. Lewis R. Tamblyn, Executive Secretary of the Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, who was the first to see the value of this study for education and for his organization. He arranged for the printing and mailing of the questionnaires under the sponsorship of his Department. He also plans to use some of the findings in a publication on the topic of Innovative Educational Services to Rural Youth.

A constant critic and friendly advisor during the developmental stages of this study was Mr. Thomas D. Clemens, Chief, Research Utilization Branch, Division of Information Technology and Dissemination, Bureau of Research, U.S. Office of Education. Mr. Clemens directed the writer toward many key references and studies and helped him develop some of the basic concepts for the study.

The writer is grateful to Dr. E. Robert Stephens, Associate Professor of Education, University of Iowa, who helped code and analyze the data. His associate, Dr. James Maxey of the Measurement Research Center at Iowa City, was particularly helpful in arranging for the use of the Center's computers and in interpreting the output.

Grateful acknowledgment is also made to the following individuals who have contributed significantly to the successful completion of this work:

Dr. David Iwamoto for his sacrifice of time to help with the tables and with the presentation of the data.

Mrs. Juliet Rendely, who has assisted me in the bibliographic research and who kept account of the extensive follow up of non-respondents to the survey.

Mrs. Christine Vaillancourt, who helped with the mailout and kept records of the returns.

Mr. Richard R. Goulet, who read the manuscript and made many useful editorial suggestions.

Dr. Stuart Westerlund, who helped develop the analysis plan.

The writer is particularly indebted to the firm guidance of Dr. Robert E. Baker, who gave him encouragement to continue his studies throughout a period of crises when the achievement of this educational objective seemed remote, indeed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE. v

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS vii

LIST OF TABLES xi

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION. 1

Perspective for the Study 1
Purpose of the Study. 8
Definition of Terms 9
Methods of Procedures 11
The Scope of the Study. 15
Significance of the Study 16

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE. 21

Literature on Title III Developments. 22
Literature on Title III Evaluation. 38
Literature on Educational Change. 78
Summary 96

III. PROCEDURES USED IN MAKING THE STUDY 99

Selecting the Problem 99
Selecting the Dependent Variables 100
Designing the Questionnaire 102
Determining the Population. 106
Testing the Instrument. 107
Collecting the Data 109

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA. 114

Extent of Continuation. 115
Characteristics of Projects 134
Social System Variables 156
Characteristics of the Superintendent 178

Chapter | Page

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 197

Summary of Findings 197
Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations . 207

BIBLIOGRAPHY 217

APPENDICES 224

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Summary of Title III Projects Submitted and Approved by Fiscal Year. 39

2. Summary of Title III Projects Operating by Fiscal Year. 41

3. Number of Operational Proposals Approved by Categories, Fiscal Year 1966 43

4. Ratings on Four Objectives by Directors, State Coordinators, and Consultants, Number in Per Cent Categories. 66

5. Average Amount of Title III Funds Spent Per Individual Served. 76

6. Numbers and Per Cents Response to Telephone Query on Continuation of Projects of Non-Respondents to Questionnaire 110

7. Comparison of Telephone Interview and Questionnaire Respondents, Numbers and Per Cents 111

8. Summary of Questionnaires Returned by Title III Superintendents. 115

9. Numbers and Per Cents of Continuation of Title III Projects Following Termination of Federal Grants 116

10. Continuation of Title III Projects by State, Numbers and Per Cents. 117

11. Continuation of Title III Projects by Four Geographical Regions, Numbers and Per Cents. . . 121

12. Continuation of Title III Projects by Single District and Multiple-District Classifications, Numbers and Per Cents. 122

13. Continuation of Title III Projects, by Most Innovative and Less Innovative Categories, Numbers and Per Cents. 124

Table Page

14. Continuation of Title III Projects by Rural, Urban, and Combined Classifications, Numbers and Per Cents. 126

15. Sources of Funding by Continuation of Title III Projects, Numbers and Per Cents. 128

16. Superintendents Recommending Continuation and Discontinuation, Numbers and Per Cents 130

17. Continuation of the Projects by Amounts of Instructional Materials Produced, Numbers and Per Cents. 131

18. Numbers, Means, and Standard Deviations of Outside Visitors to Title III Projects During Three Years. 132

19. Numbers, Means, and Standard Deviations of Similar Programs Started as a Result of Visits to Projects During Three Years. 133

20. Dollar Amounts and Per Cents of Three-Year Project Funds From Title III, Local, and Other Sources, Continued Versus Discontinued Projects 135

21. Persons Served by Projects, Numbers, and Per Cents by Extent of Continuation. 137

22. Comparison of the Means and Standard Deviations of Dollar Amounts of Continued Versus Discontinued Projects 137

23. Numbers, Per Cents, Means, and Standard Deviations of Projects with Various Percentages of Budget Devoted to Training, Continued Versus Discontinued Projects. 139

24. Numbers, Per Cents, Means, and Standard Deviations of Projects with Various Percentages of Budgets Devoted to Dissemination, Continued Versus Discontinued Projects. 141

25. Numbers, Per Cents, Means, and Standard Deviations of Projects with Various Percentages of Budget Devoted to Evaluation, Continued Versus Discontinued Projects. 143

26. Comparisons of Major Program Emphases in Projects by Continuation Categories, Numbers and Per Cents. 145

Table Page

27. Continuation of Projects by Grade Levels, Numbers and Per Cents. 148

28. Participation in Project Development by Selected Personnel in the Schools and Community, Numbers and Per Cents. 150

29. Numbers, Means, and Per Cents of Continuation of Projects by Eight Ranges of Per Pupil Cost . . . 154

30. Superintendents' Perceptions of Selected Traits of Project Innovations, Numbers and Per Cents of Responses by Continuation Categories. 157

31. Continuation of Projects by Per Pupil Expenditure of the School Districts, Numbers, Per Cents and Means. 161

32. Continuation of Projects Serving a Single School District by Size of Enrollments, Numbers, Per Cents, and Means 163

33. Continuation of Projects Serving Multiple School Districts by Size of Enrollments, Numbers, Per Cents, and Means 165

34. Continuation of Projects by Per Cent of High School Graduating Classes Entering Colleges, Numbers and Per Cents. 167

35. Continuation of Projects by Income Levels of Constituents in the School Districts, Numbers and Per Cents. 168

36. Continuation of Projects by Source of Superintendents, Numbers and Per Cents 170

37. Continuation of Projects by Amount of Innovations Attempted in the Past, Numbers and Per Cents . . 172

38. Continuation of Projects by Proportion of Superintendents' Decisions Accepted by Boards of Education, Numbers and Per Cents 175

39. Continuation of Projects by Superintendents' Perception of Community Receptivity to New Ideas, Numbers and Per Cents 177

40. Continuation of Projects by Age of the Superintendents, Numbers and Per Cents 180

Table Page

41. Continuation of Projects by Educational Attainment of the Superintendents, Numbers and Per Cents. 181

42. Continuation of Projects by Years of Experience as Superintendent, Numbers and Per Cents 183

43. Continuation of Projects by Places of Birth of the Superintendents, Numbers and Per Cents 185

44. Continuation of Projects by Numbers of Times Superintendents Changed Communities Since Leaving College, Excluding Military, Numbers and Per Cents. 187

45. Continuation of Projects by Numbers of Meetings Attended by Superintendents Outside the State During Past Three Years, Numbers and Per Cents . 189

46. Continuation of Projects by Superintendents' Attitudes Toward Educational Innovations, Numbers and Per Cents. 191

47. Continuation of Projects by Superintendents' Self-Ratings as Liberal or Conservative, Numbers and Per Cents. 194

48. Continuation of Projects by Communication Behavior of the Superintendents, Numbers and Per Cents. 196

49. Sources of Funds for Continuation by Urban, Rural, and Combined Classifications, Numbers and Per Cents. 263

50. Superintendents Recommending Continuation and Discontinuation by Urban, Rural, and Combined Classifications, Numbers and Per Cents 264

51. Numbers and Per Cents of Projects Producing Instructional Materials by Urban, Rural, and Combined Classifications 264

52. Numbers, Per Cents, and Means of Projects with Various Percentages of Budgets Devoted to Training by Urban, Rural, and Combined Classifications. 265

53. Numbers, Per Cents, and Means of Projects with Various Percentages of Budgets Devoted to Dissemination by Urban, Rural, and Combined Classifications. 266

Table | Page

54. Numbers, Per Cents, and Means of Projects with Various Percentages of Budget Devoted to Evaluation by Urban, Rural, and Combined Classifications. 267

55. Major Program Emphasis of Projects by Urban, Rural, and Combined Classifications, Numbers and Per Cents. 268

56. Urban, Rural, and Combined Classifications of Projects by Grade Level, Numbers and Per Cents . 269

57. Numbers and Per Cents of Participation in Project Development by Selected Personnel in the Schools and Community by Urban, Rural, and Combined Classifications 270

58. Numbers, Per Cents, and Means of Per Pupil Cost of Urban, Rural, and Combined Classifications. . 272

59. Numbers and Per Cents of Superintendents' Perceptions of Selected Traits of Project Innovations by Urban, Rural, and Combined Classifications. 273

60. Numbers, Per Cents, and Means of Urban, Rural, and Combined Classifications by Per Pupil Expenditure Categories 274

61. Numbers, Per Cents, and Means of Urban, Rural, and Combined Classifications by Size of Pupil Enrollments of Single School District Projects . 275

62. Numbers, Per Cents, and Means of Urban, Rural, and Combined Classifications by Size of Pupil Enrollments in Multiple School District Projects 276

63. Numbers and Per Cents of High School Graduating Classes Entering Colleges by Urban, Rural, and Combined Classifications 277

64. Numbers and Per Cents of Projects by Income Levels of Constituents in the School Districts by Urban, Rural, and Combined Classifications . . . 278

65. Numbers and Per Cents of Projects by Source of Superintendents by Urban, Rural, and Combined Classifications. 279

Table Page

66. Numbers and Per Cents of Innovations Attempted in the Past by Urban, Rural, and Combined Classifications. 280

67. Proportions of Superintendents' Decisions Accepted by Boards of Education by Urban, Rural, and Combined Classifications 281

68. Numbers and Per Cent of Superintendents' Perception of Community Receptivity to New Ideas by Urban, Rural, and Combined Classifications. 282

69. Urban, Rural, and Combined Distribution of Projects by Ages of the Superintendents, Numbers and Per Cents. 283

70. Urban, Rural, and Combined Distribution of Projects by Educational Attainment of the Superintendent, Numbers and Per Cents. 284

71. Urban, Rural, and Combined Distribution of Projects by Years of Experience as Superintendent, Numbers and Per Cents. 285

72. Urban, Rural, and Combined Distribution of Projects by Place of Birth of the Superintendents, Numbers and Per Cents 286

73. Urban, Rural, and Combined Distribution of Projects by Numbers of Times Superintendents Changed Communities Since Leaving College, Excluding Military, Numbers and Per Cents. . . . 287

74. Urban, Rural, and Combined Distribution of Projects by Numbers of Meetings Attended by Superintendent Outside the State During Past Three Years, Numbers and Per Cents 288

75. Urban, Rural, and Combined Distribution of Projects by Responses of Superintendents on Attitudes Toward Educational Innovations, Numbers and Per Cents. 289

76. Urban, Rural, and Combined Distribution of Projects by Superintendents' Self-Rating as Liberal or Conservative, Numbers and Per Cents . 290

77. Urban, Rural, and Combined Distribution of Projects by Communication Behavior of the Superintendents, Numbers and Per Cents 291

Table Page

78. Sources of Continuation Funds by Most Innovative and Less Innovative Projects, Numbers and Per Cents. 293

79. Innovative Project Distribution by Kind of Superintendents' Recommendations on Continuation, Numbers and Per Cents. 294

80. Numbers and Per Cents of Projects Producing Instructional Materials by Most Innovative and Less Innovative Classifications. 295

81. Innovative Distribution of Projects With Various Percentages of Budget Devoted to Training, Numbers and Per Cents. 296

82. Innovative Distribution of Projects With Various Percentages of Budget Devoted to Dissemination, Numbers and Per Cents. 297

83. Innovative Distribution of Projects With Various Percentages of Budget Devoted to Evaluation, Numbers and Per Cents. 298

84. Innovative Distribution of Projects by Major Emphasis, Numbers and Per Cents. 299

85. Innovative Distribution of Projects by Grade Level, Numbers and Per Cents 300

86. Innovative Distribution of Projects by Participation in Project Development by Selected Personnel in the Schools and Community, Numbers and Per Cents 301

87. Numbers, Per Cents, and Means of Per Pupil Cost of Most and Less Innovative Projects. 303

88. Innovative Distribution of Projects by Superintendents' Perceptions of Selected Traits, Numbers and Per Cents. 304

89. Numbers, Per Cents, and Means of Projects by Most and Less Innovative Classifications by Expenditure Per Child. 305

90. Numbers, Per Cents, and Means of Most and Less Innovative Projects by Size of Pupil Enrollments of Single School District Projects 306

Table | Page

91. Numbers, Per Cents, and Means of Most and Less Innovative Projects by Size of Pupil Enrollments of Multiple School District Projects. 307

92. Numbers and Per Cents of High School Graduating Classes Entering Colleges, by Most and Less Innovative Classifications. 308

93. Numbers and Per Cents of Most and Less Innovative Projects by Income Levels of Constituents in the School Districts. 309

94. Numbers and Per Cents of Most and Less Innovative Projects by Source of Superintendents 310

95. Numbers and Per Cents of Innovations Attempted in the Past by Most and Less Innovative Projects . . 311

96. Proportions of Superintendents' Decisions Accepted by Boards of Education by Most and Less Innovative Projects 312

97. Numbers and Per Cents of Most and Less Innovative Projects Classified According to Superintendents' Perception of Community Receptivity to New Ideas 313

98. Numbers and Per Cents of Most and Less Innovative Projects by Ages of the Superintendents 314

99. Numbers and Per Cents of Most and Less Innovative Projects by Educational Attainments of the Superintendents 315

100. Numbers and Per Cents of Most and Less Innovative Projects by Years of Experience as Superintendent. 316

101. Numbers and Per Cents of Most and Less Innovative Projects by Place of Birth of the Superintendents 317

102. Numbers and Per Cents of Most and Less Innovative Projects by Number of Times Superintendent Changed Communities Since Leaving College, Excluding Military. 318

103. Numbers and Per Cents of Most and Less Innovative Projects by Number of Meetings Attended by Superintendent Outside the State During Past Three Years 319

Table Page

104. Numbers and Per Cents of Most and Less Innovative Projects by Responses of Superintendents on Attitudes Toward Educational Innovations. 320

105. Numbers and Per Cents of Most and Less Innovative Projects by Superintendents' Self-Rating as Liberal or Conservative 321

106. Numbers and Per Cents of Most and Less Innovative Projects by Communication Behavior of the Superintendents 322

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study was an attempt to determine the extent to which educational innovations developed through federally-funded projects of Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act will be continued and thus adopted by the local public school system or by other school systems in the United States.[1] This information was obtained by a questionnaire survey of the school superintendents of the applicant school districts for the 330 operational projects which had been approved and funded by the U.S. Office of Education in fiscal year 1966 for a three-year project period. These projects then were analyzed according to selected variables in order to determine which factors, if any, were associated with the continuation of Title III projects in local school districts.

Perspective for the Study

The signing of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act on April 11, 1965 by President Lyndon B. Johnson heralded the first billion-dollar breakthrough for massive federal support for elementary and secondary education. Though Title I of ESEA, with a $1.01 billion authorization for disadvantaged youth, was the substantive argument for the Act, it was Title III, with its $100 million authorization for supplementary services and centers, that helped break the political deadlocks which had so long blocked extensive federal support for elementary and secondary education.[1] For it was in this concept of "supplementary" that the private school sector saw its first real hope for substantial federal aid for nonpublic school pupils.[2]

---

[1] U.S. Congress, The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Public Law 89-10, H.R. 2362, 89th Congress, 1st session, 1965, pp. 15-18.

Also explicit in this concept of centers and services was the mandate that such programs be "exemplary" to serve as "models." The purpose of the title as stated in Section 301 of the Act was as follows:

> For the purpose of enabling the Commissioner, through grants for supplementary educational centers and services, to stimulate and assist in the provision of vitally needed educational services not available in sufficient quantity or quality in elementary and secondary schools and in the development and establishment of exemplary elementary and secondary educational school programs to serve as models for regular school programs. . . .[3]

Francis Keppel, then U.S. Commissioner of Education, interpreted this to mean that "innovation" and "experimentation" would be brought into the educational enterprise. Citing three particular concerns for Title III, in testimony to the House of

---

[1] James W. Guthrie, "A Political Case History: Passage of ESEA," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX, No. 6, (February, 1968), p. 305.

[2] Doris Kearns, "E.S.E.A.-A New Element," Notes and Working Papers Concerning the Administration of Programs Authorized Under Title III of Public Law 89-10, U.S. Congress, Senate Subcommittee on Education, (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), pp. 16-17.

[3] U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Education and Labor, Hearings, Aid to Elementary and Secondary Education, Part I, 89th Congress, 1st Session, 1965, p. 33.

Representatives, he said that in addition to providing "supplementary" services, and bringing a higher "quality education," Title III is ". . .to insure that flexibility, innovation, and experimentation become an integral part of our educational system."[1]

Joseph Murphy, then Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Program Coordination, summarized what Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Gardner felt was the purpose of Title III; that is, "to rethink the whole process and organization of education and reshape it to fit the times."[2]

Mr. Murphy also accepted the popular analogy between Title III and educational foundations. He said that:

> The apparent thrust of the Title III concept appears, on the fact of its stated objectives, to be similar to the sort of enterprise in which several major private foundations have engaged. It is conceived by some to be a program which distributes, on the basis of merit and imagination, rather than need, resources designed to stimulate new programs and imaginative efforts in the field of education.[3]

Acting from this perspective of Title III, Commissioner Keppel ordered a revision of the Title III Guidelines, the USOE's administrative manual for use by local school systems in submitting applications for projects. He specifically stressed putting the emphasis on "innovations," rather than on

---

[1] Ibid., p. 94.

[2] Joseph Murphy, "ESEA Title III: Illusion and Reality," unpublished report (undated) p. 1.

[3] Ibid., pp. 2-3.

"supplementary centers and services."[1]

Later, the writer was asked by Ralph J. Becker, Officer in Charge, to develop an acronym for Title III which would emphasize innovation. PACE, Projects to Advance Creativity in Education, was agreed upon.

Egon Guba's model of the change process was adapted for use in conceptualizing the Title III role and in setting priorities for project approval.[2] The Guidelines, now entitled A Manual for Project Applicants, were rewritten to set forth the objectives of Title III as that of encouraging and demonstrating educational innovations.[3]

Thus, the policy directions for the administration of Title III were firmly pointed out. The Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers, which was designated to review and recommend approval of the proposals, issued its manual and announced deadlines for the submission of proposals by local school districts.

However, despite all of the emphasis on innovation, when the Title III proposals from local districts were reviewed by the U.S. Office of Education administrators and others, it was quite obvious to well-read observers that there was very little in them that seemed really "innovative." Specialists from the field brought into the Office to review each project made the same observations. Nation's Schools carried an article which, in fact, made this very point somewhat sarcastically.[1]

---

[1] The writer helped rewrite these sections of the Guidelines under the chairmanship of Dr. Nolan Estes, whom Keppel was to later appoint Associate Commissioner for Elementary and Secondary Education.

[2] Egon G. Guba, "The Process of Educational Improvement," Educational Change, The Reality and the Promise, (ed.) Richard R. Goulet, (New York: Citation Press, 1968), pp. 136-153.

[3] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, A Manual for Project Applicants: Title III Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 1966, p. 1.

Soon thereafter, the Office of Education re-examined its definition of "innovative." Following several months of debate, the Title III managers arrived at the concept that few really new ideas come along during any one generation and that the definition of innovation should be relative.[2] Innovative was defined to mean "new for the state or geographic region in which the applicant was located."[3]

Congress, in a later committee report, showed its concern and expressed concurrence with this definition in the following words:

> Some concern has been expressed that the standard used by the Office of Education for deciding whether an application embodied an 'innovative' approach has been too rigid and unrealistic. The committee understands that, if an idea, practice, or technique was in use in one part of the country it was not 'innovative' in another area of the country. If this is the case, the standard is not in accord with congressional intent. . . .For the purposes of Title III, the term 'innovation' is defined as the adoption of new or improved educational ideas, practices, or techniques. This definition will not support

---

[1] "What Title III Projects Need: More Innovation," Nation's Schools, LXXVIII (August, 1966), pp. 42-45.

[2] Harold Howe II, "Lighthouses of Innovation," Educational Change, (ed.), Richard Goulet, loc. cit., p. 181.

[3] Interview with Ralph J. Becker, Director of the Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers, USOE, May 11, 1969.

> setting of a nationwide standard. A 'new or improved' approach in one area may not be 'new or improved' in another area.[1]

Of course, even the eminent researcher Everett M. Rogers defined an innovation as "an idea perceived as new by the individual."[2] Such a definition, however, tended to move Title III out of the "research" or "inquiry and invention" phases of Guba's change model, and established it more realistically in the diffusion of educational innovations phase. Guba maintained that "the purpose of diffusion activities is to create an awareness and understanding of an invention and to provide opportunity for its assessment."[3] Referring to the Title III Manual's statement of purposes, he also noted that "the major diffusion responsibility. . .seems to be falling squarely on the shoulders of the Title III projects."[4]

The 1967 amendments to ESEA put even greater emphasis on diffusion by authorizing state administrative funds to be used to evaluate, disseminate, and provide for the "adoption and adaption of promising educational practices."[5]

---

[1] U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Labor and Welfare, Report, Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967, 90th Congress, 1st Session, 1967, p. 28.

[2] Everett M. Rogers, Diffusion of Innovations, (New York: The Free Press, 1965), p. 13.

[3] Guba, loc. cit., p. 148.

[4] Guba, loc. cit., p. 147.

[5] U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967 with Background Materials and Tables, 90th Congress, 2nd Session, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968), pp. 6-16.

The role of Title III in the diffusion of educational innovation again was stressed in a series of three regional meetings with state administrators of Title III, in preparing them for the transition of the direct administration of the projects from the USOE to the states. In a paper presented at regional conferences of state administrators, Title III state officials were told that:

> . . .diffusion is the total process of implementing the spread of educational innovations. Its objective is to (1) create a widespread awareness of inventions on the part of practitioners . . .and (2) to afford an opportunity to examine and assess the operating qualities of the innovation. In other words, to demonstrate.[1]

Citing Miles' research on how people seem to need a "trial" phase before adoption of an innovation, the writer informed state officials that the State Plans for Title III, subject to approval by the USOE, ". . .should provide for activities which bring practitioners into contact with the innovation and thus engage them in the critical evaluation phase of the change process."

Thus, as demonstration programs, the Title III projects operating in a locale on an "ad hoc" basis, gave the practitioners an opportunity to try out the new ideas in their home grounds without reprisal, since no major local commitment of funds was required.

At the same time, the demonstrations provided an opportunity for educators and interested citizens from other communities to observe the innovations and engage in an initial assessment of their relevance to the local educational problems.

---

[1] Norman E. Hearn, "Considerations for Designing a State Strategy for Diffusion of Educational Innovations." Paper read before three Regional Conferences of State Title III Administrators, St. Louis, March 11, 1969, Denver, March 13, 1969, and Hartford, March 19, 1969.

In this context, the critical questions to be asked in any evaluation of Title III are:

1. To what extent are these "trial" periods paying off in terms of local adoption by the host school districts?
2. To what extent are other school districts using the demonstrations as an opportunity to evaluate the programs for their own possible use and adoption?
3. Do certain geographic areas and/or personal characteristics of school administrators contribute to the adoption of educational innovations?

This study was designed to seek answers to these questions.

Purpose of the Study

The major purposes of this study were (1) to determine how many of the public school districts receiving three-year grants under Title III would be continuing the programs following the termination of federal funds, and (2) to determine which of several selected variables, if any, might be used to predict the successful adoption of educational innovations by local school systems.

The information sought was relevant to the following three hypotheses:

1. The adoption of a Title III innovation is related to certain personal characteristics of the superintendent.
2. The adoption of a Title III innovation is related to certain properties or characteristics of the innovation itself.
3. The adoption of the Title III innovation is related to certain characteristics of the social system in which it operates.

Information also was sought on the extent of local commitment to continue the programs in terms of whether the school districts would terminate activities completely, reduce activities to serve fewer schools and pupils, continue the programs at the same level, on about the same scale, or expand the programs. Data were collected regarding the extent of each project's demonstration activities, including the number of persons that had visited the program and the number of similar programs which may have been installed in schools as a result of viewing the project activities. These data would serve to partially evaluate the effectiveness of Title III as a demonstration program.

Definition of Terms

In the interest of clarity, definitions are given for some of the terms used most frequently in this study. Some of the definitions are unique to the purposes of this study, but most are found in the literature on change and innovation or are contained in official documents of the U.S. Government.

USOE. - The Office of Education of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

BESE. - Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, USOE.

DPSC. - Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers, BESE, USOE.

ERIC. - Educational Resources Information Center, Bureau of Research, USOE.

ESEA. - The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-10), as amended in 1966 (P.L. 89-750), and in 1967 (P.L. 90-247).

Title III. - Unless otherwise stated, it refers to Sections 301 through 308 of Public Law 89-10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended.

PACE. - Projects to Advance Creativity in Education, an acronym for the Title III program of ESEA.

Guidelines. - Policy interpretations of a program by USOE, often used synonymously with Manual for Project Applicants, Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Project. - An administratively and fiscally self-contained program for planning or delivering educational services to persons in a school system. In this study, a Title III grant following a proposal to the U.S. Office of Education.

Proposal. - An application to the USOE describing a proposed Title III project.

Demonstration. - An activity which shows or explains the operational qualities and relative value of a new practice. In this study, it refers to Title III projects and is sometimes used synonymously with project.

Adopter. - One who installs an innovation.

Change Agent. - A person or agency that facilitates the introduction of an innovation into a school system, a catalyst.

Diffusion. - A step in the change process which involves telling, showing, helping, involving, training, and intervening.[1]

Dissemination. - The process of giving and receiving information about an activity, person, or idea; part of the diffusion process.

Educational Innovation. - A new educational practice involving one or more changes in curriculum, methodology, organization, personnel utilization, often, but not always, including the use of new equipment or materials. "New" is defined as new to the user or new to the geographic area.

Evaluation. - The process of determining the extent to which an activity has accomplished its objectives; often, but not necessarily, followed by a judgment as to whether this activity and objective was as valuable as other similar or dissimilar activities or had relative value to individuals and society.

School System. - A public body having the responsibility for conducting educational programs for youth and certain adults. In this study, used interchangeably with "school district" or "local educational agency."

Methods of Procedures

Data for this study were collected using a thirty-nine item questionnaire addressed to superintendents of school districts with grants under Title III. Its approach resembles mostly what Van Dalen describes as a "school survey,"[1] since it collected data about the project's "setting," "educational characteristics," and the Title III project processes. Research was also in the nature of documentary analyses, since official government records and files were used to develop initial data for the subsequent literature review and survey. Some bibliographic research was also undertaken to develop the conceptual framework for the study. As such, the study can be best described as descriptive research.

---

[1] Guba, loc. cit., p. 140.

The specific procedures will be discussed in a later chapter, but they may be summarized as follows:

1. The literature describing the change process in education and other fields, such as rural sociology and anthropology, was reviewed for possible pertinence to Title III.
2. Evaluation studies of Title III were located, reviewed and examined for data which might corroborate, or relate to, the findings of the proposed survey. The legislative history of ESEA was reviewed to describe the development and identify the basic intent of Title III.
3. A questionnaire was designed to solicit data from superintendents regarding the status of activities

---

[1] Deobold B. Van Dalen, Understanding Educational Research, An Introduction (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1962), p. 188.

in Title III and the possible variables affecting the success or failure of programs to be adopted by the school district.

4. A survey population of 330 was identified by consulting the official USOE files to determine when projects had been or were to be terminated. Projects were included in the survey if they had been approved in fiscal year 1966 (July 1, 1965 to June 30, 1966) and if they had operated the full three years of the project term, or if they would terminate three years of operation under a Title III grant by June 30, 1969, or shortly thereafter.
5. Once identified, the abstracts of these 330 projects were clipped from Pacesetters in Innovation[1] and placed on single 6" X 8" cards. By reading these abstracts, the projects were coded as either "single-district" or "multiple-district," according to whether the activities in the project served more than one school district.
6. The questionnaire was mailed to ten superintendents for a pre-test of the instrument. An open-ended questionnaire was included to solicit their comments as to the availability of data, sensitivity of the questions, and general appropriateness of the items. Eight were returned with comments.

---

[1] Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Pacesetters in Innovation, Fiscal Year 1966, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office) 1967.

7. The questionnaire was reviewed by several knowledgeable individuals, including Dr. Leon M. Lessinger; Associate Commissioner of Education; Dr. Lewis R. Tamblyn, Executive Secretary, Department of Rural Education, N.E.A.; Dr. Glenn Robinson, Assistant Secretary, Research Division, N.E.A.; Thomas E. Clemens, Bureau of Research, USOE, and members of the writer's doctoral advisory committee.
8. Following revisions, which incorporated the comments and suggestions of the persons listed above, the questionnaire was sent to the 330 superintendents by the Department of Rural Education on February 5 and 6, 1969. A self-addressed and stamped return envelope was enclosed.
9. A followup post card was sent to non-respondents on March 5, 1969. A third follow up was conducted by telephone during the week of March 26 through April 2, 1969.
10. With 256 returns, representing 78 per cent of the population, the survey was closed on April 20. The questionnaires were forwarded to the Measurement Research Center, Iowa City, Iowa for processing.
11. The findings were analyzed for possible significant variables which may have influenced the extent of continuation of Title III projects. Appropriate tables were prepared.
12. The data were analyzed and conclusions and recommendations were made for possible application

to USOE program management and for further research.

The Scope of the Study

In order to establish a field of study which might be covered with reasonable completeness within the constraints of time and resources, the scope of the study was arbitrarily limited in several respects:

It deals with the period from April 11, 1965 to April 30, 1969. This was the period of development, organization, and operation of the Title III program. However, a few references on the diffusion process and innovation are earlier than 1965.

It deals only with Title III of ESEA. Though other federal programs, such as Headstart, may be innovative and would lend themselves to a similar study, Title III was chosen for study because it seems most clearly to be a change strategy or diffusion program in the same sense as the Department of Agriculture's Extension Service. Also, the writer was personally familiar with all aspects of the Title III program in an administrative capacity since its inception.

It deals only with Title III projects that were approved in fiscal year 1966. Fiscal year 1966 projects were chosen for the study because they were the only projects that had, or would have completed, by July 1, 1969, the full three years of operation that the USOE managers set as a project period.

It deals only with operational projects. During the first fiscal year, 2,706 proposals were submitted to the USOE of which 1,085 were approved. Of these, 420 were for operational projects and 665 were for planning projects. Planning grants were generally for one-year periods and were to result in an operational grant the following year. Of the 420, 330 projects had received a third year operational grant. A survey of the projects that terminated after less than two years of operation was undertaken by Anthony John Polemeni and is summarized in the chapter on "Review of the Literature."[1]

It deals only with the perceptions of superintendents of schools of Title III grantee districts. The questionnaire was addressed to superintendents with instructions concerning the completion of each item. The assumption was made that the superintendents would complete the items truthfully and to the best of their abilities. In cases where the project period was not to end until after June 30, 1969 (about one-third of the cases), the assumption was made that the superintendent would know by April of this year whether funds were budgeted for the continuation of project activities following the termination of Federal funding. It was further assumed that the survey instrument was valid for collecting the kinds of information needed.

Significance of the Study

Recently, Dr. Lewis R. Tamblyn, in releasing some preliminary information on the study, said that he regarded the tentative finding of a 90 per cent continuation rate as "significant, and even startling" since there is general feeling that once federal funding is withdrawn, the innovation ceases.[1]

---

[1] Anthony John Polemeni, "A Study of Title III Projects, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 83-53 (89-10), After the Approved Funding Periods," (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, School of Education, St. Johns University, 1969).

Evidence of this concern by Congress was revealed when members of the Education Committees were surveyed for an article on Congressional expectations on evaluation in Title III.[2]

Senator Peter H. Dominick of Colorado said:

> As a legislator, I am vitally concerned whether (Title III projects) are in fact accomplishing the objectives envisioned by Congress and whether the money appropriated is being properly spent. . .I am specifically concerned about whether the program conducted will have a lasting effect on the school--or if, when the money for a project is exhausted and the initial program is terminated, the tent will be folded with little imprint on the educational processes of the school.

Representative Carl D. Perkins of Kentucky, Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee replied that it was the generally-held opinion among Congress that:

> . . .all educational projects, including ongoing programs, (need) to have built-in requirements with respect to evaluation and the effect such would have in stimulating local changes, adaptions, redirections and revisions. . .

Representative John N. Erlenborn of Illinois noted that Congress had a need for information concerning:

> . . .which of these innovative programs, if any, have been adopted as regular teaching programs.

Representative Patsy T. Mink of Hawaii expressed the same general sentiment. She said:

> Our highest hope for Title III, of course, would be realized if the stimuli that is providing

---

[1] Washington Monitor, March 31, 1969, p. 1.

[2] "View from the Top: Congressmen Look at Evaluation," PACEreport, November, 1967, pp. 5-8.

> for innovation and experimentation in the classroom would carry over to general education. . .

This study becomes particularly significant when it is realized that this is the first effort to determine the extent of Title III continuations. As these legislators implied, the fate of Title III could well depend upon the availability of valid information as to the degree of adoptions by local schools. The Title III National Study team during the transition of Title III from direct federal to state administration showed similar concern in these words:

> . . .education has much at stake in the continuation of Title III's venture capital--the first 'thinking money' that school districts have ever had and in the success of the states in building upon the thrust. Otherwise, if Title III should someday lose or forget this major premise and early promise, it is predictable that, of necessity, another fund will emerge elsewhere, quite possibly from those agencies dealing with the agony of the cities, to recover and resume the unique quest that was Title III's. The Nation has a right to expect that education will lead in its own renewal. Title III is the sharpest tool to that end.[1]

Matthew Miles in a concluding comment in his book Innovation in Education said that the book's purpose was "to stimulate more inquiry into the nature of education innovation, and to widen the range of coherent possibilities for innovative practice."[2] It was this book that stimulated the writer to include data in the study which might give some insight into the reasons why some projects were more successful than others in becoming institutionalized or adopted by the local school district. For the purposes of this study, therefore, it was assumed that the USOE was acting as an outside change agent[1] or catalyst by virtue of having made a grant to a local school system for the purpose of demonstrating an innovation which could serve as a model. It was the major purpose of such grants to provide the local schools with an opportunity to evaluate the innovations for possible continuation and, thus, adoption, after the federal grant period ended.[2] The superintendent of schools therefore was the potential adopter of the innovation for his school. Research has shown rather conclusively that it is the superintendent who initiates and carries out school programs.[3] It was also assumed that the superintendent had passed through the "awareness," "interest," and "evaluation" stages described by Everett Rogers.[4]

---

[1] Memorandum to the Honorable Harold Howe II, U.S. Commissioner of Education, from the Title III National Study team, March 21, 1968.

[2] Matthew B. Miles, (ed.) Innovation in Education, (New York: Columbia University, 1964), pp. 660-661.

By applying for and receiving a federal grant, he had made the decision to give the innovation a validity test, or "dry run," as a "temporary system" within his school system.[5]

---

[1] "Change agent: a professional person who attempts to influence the adoption decisions in a direction he feels is desirable" from Everett M. Rogers, Diffusion of Innovation, (New York: The Free Press, 1965), p. 254.

[2] Nolan Estes, "The Intent and Nature of ESEA Title III," Theory into Practice, TIP, VI, (June, 1967), pp. 112-115.

[3] Henry M. Brickell, "State Organization for Educational Change: A Case Study and a Proposal," Innovation in Education, (ed.) Matthew B. Miles, (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964), p. 503.

[4] Rogers, loc. cit., pp. 81-86.

[5] Matthew B. Miles, "Planned Change and Organizational Health: Figure and Ground," Change Process in the Public Schools, (ed.) Thomas E. Wood, (Eugene: University of Oregon, Bureau of Educational Research, 1967), p. 30.

The publication by the Committee for Economic Development, Paying for Better Schools, contained this statement:

> Methods of determining what is useful and accelerating the adoption of proven ideas may well be the greatest need of all in our educational system.[1]

Title III may contain the above "methods." Certainly, the literature suggests that its major purpose was to accelerate the adoption of ideas by local schools.[2] It was an underlying purpose of this study to clarify the Title III role in the federal aid picture and, in the process, to develop some basic data from which decision-makers--Members of Congress, members of the President's staff, and others--could conduct a realistic assessment of the effectiveness of Title III. The findings could, therefore, be used by granting institutions, federal, state, and private educational foundations, to help them refine the criteria used to review and evaluate proposals for innovative programs. Results might also be useful to school administrators who make decisions about the feasibility of installing innovations. The study could have implications for the trainers of school administrators. Hopefully, it will add significantly to the body of knowledge about the change process in the American public schools.

---

[1] Committee for Economic Development, Innovation in Education: New Directions for the American School, a statement on public policy prepared by the Research and Policy Committee (New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1968), p. 7.

[2] U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Government Operations, Hearings, Operations of the Office of Education, 90th Congress, 1st Session, 1967, pp. 10-11.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This study was concerned with three reasonably distinct bodies of knowledge. First, as an introduction to the data on the extent of continuation or adoption of Title III programs by local educational agencies, background documentation was needed concerning the development and interpretation of Title III by Congress and by the federal agencies administering the program. Some of this documentation was attempted in the previous chapter. However, this chapter will discuss in more depth some of the materials already introduced, and will cover additional documents which provide significant information on the development of the Title III program. Most of the references will be official U.S. Government records and reports.

The second major area of literature directly related to this study includes those studies that have attempted to evaluate the operational effectiveness of the Title III program, to date. This literature includes official USOE in-house reports and evaluations, studies by independent study teams which were funded by the USOE, and a dissertation which is similar in content and approach to this one.

The third body of literature relevant to this study is categorized by various descriptors, all somewhat interrelated.

These descriptors include: educational change, educational innovation, dissemination, research utilization, diffusion, and adoption or adaption. The body of knowledge in these areas is so extensive that only a few of the major works will be covered in depth.

Literature on Title III Development

The documents reviewed in this section include hearings by both the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate from 1965 through April 1969, various Congressional committee hearings and reports, and the several guidelines or administrative manuals for Title III issued by the USOE. These documents revealed various hopes and fears of proponents and opponents of Title III, as well as indicated the development of the Title III concept during the four-years period which this literature embraces.

House Hearings, 1965[1]

The first Hearings on the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education Act were held by the House of Representatives of the 89th Congress on January 22, 23, 25, 26, and 27, 1965. They were conducted by the General Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, Adam C. Powell, Chairman.

Additional testimony was heard on January 28, 29, and 30; and on February 1 and 2, 1965. H.R. 2361 and H.R. 2363 were being considered by the Subcommittee on Education, chaired by Congressman Carl D. Perkins of Kentucky. For clarity of reference, it should be remembered that Public Law 89-10 was an amendment to Public Law 874, "Financial Assistance for Local Educational Agencies in Areas Affected by Federal Activity." It is sometimes referred to as Public Law 83-53 (89-10).

---

[1] U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Education and Welfare, Hearings, Aid to Elementary and Secondary Education, 89th Congress, 1st Session, 1965, Parts 1 and 2.

Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare began the hearings by indicating that Title III, Supplementary Centers and Services, would "enrich the program of local elementary and secondary schools and. . .encourage collaborative efforts among public and private schools. . . ." All segments of the population, including school children, could use the supplementary educational service.[1] Commissioner Francis Keppel elaborated on the kinds of services that would be possible and stressed its "innovation and experimentation" features.

Congressman John Brademas, several times during the hearings, voiced his apprehension that the centers would be controlled by public school agencies who would not be receptive to "new ideas." Superintendents of schools usually gave more testimony on Title I because of the greater money involved, but showed some interest in Title III. For example, Carl Hansen, Superintendent of Schools, District of Columbia, saw the title as ". . .a means of supplying services now lacking, and particularly to undertake the development of new curriculum approaches to the education of pupils."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 65 and 71.

The educational associations, including the National Education Association, expressed their support for ESEA. Some representatives, such as Joseph M. Brooks, Executive Secretary of the Los Angeles Teachers Association, expressed interest in Title III centers. He said:

> No one single aspect of the modern school program holds greater potential for enriching curriculum offerings to students than this concept.[2]

Harrie M. Selznick, President of the Council for Exceptional Children, underscored the need for educational services in rural areas. She was particularly impressed with the concept of mobile services for handicapped children.

Roberts S. Swanson, President of the American Industrial Arts Association saw the supplementary educational centers as helping the State of Wisconsin get the 17 regional educational units established there "off the ground."

That portion of the hearings which dealt with the use of funds for nonpublic pupils was not as uncontroversial. For example, C. Emanuel Carlson, Executive Director, Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, noted that: "if all the possible services are moved to centers, much of the life of the schools will have been relocated."[3]

Interest was expressed in the "shared-time" provision in the Act by the representatives of Catholic, Jewish, and other religious organizations.

Concern frequently was expressed as to whether the

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 190. [2] _Ibid._, p. 253. [3] _Ibid._, p. 769.

Title III centers were constitutional, since the early version of the Act specified grants to local educational agencies and did not specifically exclude nonpublic schools as applicants.

Edgar Fuller, Executive Secretary, Council of Chief State School Officers, said that a majority of the state superintendents believed that Title III education centers would create a system of education parallel to the existing one, and often privately controlled, and operated in ways that would violate the principle of most if not all state constitutions, laws, and educational policies.[1]

He recommended making Title III part of Titles I and IV, with the state educational agency included in each project. Brademas challenged his authority to speak for all of the states and his use of "tax money to oppose the will of elected representatives."[2]

A state-by-state summary of Constitutional provisions entitled, "State Law Relating to Transportation and Textbooks for Parochial School Students, and Constitutional Protection of Religious Freedom," was inserted in the hearing record by Brademas.[3]

James E. Allen, Jr., Commissioner of Education, State of New York (now U.S. Commissioner of Education), registered "strong dissent" to the provision of federal administration of the projects, arguing that the states knew the needs of its schools best. He also recommended that both state and local educational agencies be required to provide some matching funds, based on financial capacity.[1]

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 1121. [2] _Ibid_., pp. 1140-1151.

[3] _Ibid_., pp. 1449-1496.

Leo Pfeffer, Chairman, Department of Political Science, Long Island University, compared the Title III "consortiums" or dual agencies with what Taft found in the Philippines when he took over as Governor General. He said that Taft abolished them as not in the American tradition of separation of church and state. Brademas, always the defender of Title III, asked for a legal and philosophical differentiation between public aid to higher education and secondary and elementary education, but the only reply was one relying on tradition.

The American Civil Liberties Union reviewed Title III and made suggestions for changes which would assure that benefits accrued to individuals and not to institutions.

Commissioner Keppel was called back near the end of the hearings at the request of Representative Charles E. Goodell, New York, to respond to testimony concerning the "parallel system" charge made against Title III by several witnesses. A rather long dialogue developed between Keppel and Goodell, with Goodell making the point again and again that the state educational agency should control Title III. Keppel compared Title III to research programs and to the National Institutes of Health, avoiding the pitfall of implying that some states were incompetent.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 1549.

[2] Ibid., pp. 1715-1751.

Senate Hearings, 1965[1]

The hearings on ESEA by the Senate Subcommittee on Education, chaired by Senator Wayne Morse, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare took place on January 26 and 29, and on February 1, 2, 4, 8, and 11, 1965.

Many of the persons who had appeared before the House Subcommittee also testified before the Senate Subcommittee. Many of the same memoranda and publications were inserted in the record of the Hearings.

Senator Morse began with the reading of a statement by Senator Jacob K. Javits, New York, expressing the Republican support for education. Senator Peter H. Dominick, Colorado, introduced the question on constitutionality by inserting a brief on the subject into the record of the hearings.

In response to questioning, Secretary Celebrezzi introduced a written opinion from the Justice Department which advised that provisions in Title III for nonpublic participation were constitutional. Keppel's testimony was similar to his testimony before the House. However, in ensuing discussions, he tended to place more emphasis on the new concept of supplementary services, where he held that "not only the schools in our society are forces for education, but the museums, the great public libraries, the art galleries, the symphony orchestras, and, of course, for the primary and secondary schools, the universities and colleges."

---

[1] U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Hearings, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, 89th Congress, 1st Session, 1965, Parts 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. 2955 p.

Senator Yarborough raised the spectre of a "ruined public school system" such as took place in Holland when the government supported private schools. Keppel reassured him that the staff would study Section 304 to "see whether the language needs tightening up to be certain that that doesn't happen."[1]

In response to questioning by Senator Robert Kennedy about the quality of education, Keppel responded that Titles IV and III, which he compared to the successful agricultural experiment stations, would assure the establishment of new approaches in curriculum, on the order of Jerrold R. Zacharias' physics program.

Superintendents of large cities were generally more interested in the way the entire ESEA would supplement their budgets. With a few exceptions, they seemed to have little grasp of the innovative, experimentation, and supplementary center concepts of Title III. However, several showed interest in the instructional and educational television possibilities under the Title. The National Educational Broadcasters introduced 539 pages of testimony on the impact of films, television, and audiovisual aids in general.[2]

The Council of Chief State School Officers introduced the results of a survey of the chief state school officers into the record. They, too, generally approved Title III. It now was obvious that opponents of Title III were focusing on two main aspects of the Title. These were concern about the state educational agency "bypass" with its spectre of "a federal system of education," and the usual church-state argument about the constitutionality of provisions for the inclusion of nonpublic schools.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 900. In the final version of the Law, the phrase, "or other duly constituted public or nonprofit agency . . ." was deleted, thus making it impossible to make grants to nonpublic schools.

[2] Ibid., pp. 1831-2370. The USOE, in administering this program gave proposals for ETV low priority, according to Ralph J. Becker, Director of DPSC.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Report[1]

Following the Senate and House hearings, the Senate published this report summarizing and analyzing the purposes of each ESEA Title. In reference to Title III, the following points were stressed:

1. Responsibility for initiating and operating school programs rests with the state and local authorities.
2. Nothing in the Title is designed to enable local public educational agencies to provide services and programs which will inure to the enrichment of any private institution.
3. In all cases, payments will be made only to legally constituted public agencies.

The report also contains the minority views of Republicans Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin, who together had submitted suggestions for 20 amendments to ESEA, all of which were rejected.

---

[1] U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee of Labor and Public Welfare, Report, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, 89th Congress, 1st Session, 1965, H.R. 146 to accompany H.R. 2362.

The Bill was considered in the House on March 24 and 25 and passed on March 26. It was considered in the Senate on April 6 through 8, and passed on April 9. The President signed the Act April 11, 1965.

House Hearings, 1966[1]

The Subcommittee on Education held hearings on March 15, 16, 17, 18, 22, and 23, 1966, only two months following the Commissioner's announcement of the approval of the first 217 projects. The Congressmen, aware of this, asked little in the way of substantive evaluation questions throughout the hearings. They did concern themselves with the authorization for the next two years, since the initial Law had authorized $100,000,000 for the first year only. The amendments (P.L. 89-750), authorized $175,000,000 for fiscal year 1967, and $500,000,000 for fiscal year 1968.[2] Indian children in Department of Interior schools were brought under the program. Provisions were also included to give due consideration to excellence of architecture and design and to the inclusion of works of art; and special consideration was to be given to local educational agencies which were financially overburdened. Many witnesses took the opportunity again to emphasize their preference for state administration of the Title.

---

[1] U.S. Congress, House Committee on Education and Labor, Hearings, Elementary and Secondary Amendments of 1966, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, 1966, parts 1 and 2.

[2] U.S. Congress, Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966, Public Law 89-750, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, 1966.

Senate Hearings, 1966[1]

The Senate hearings were extensive, occuring on April 1, 4, 5, 19, 26, and 27, 1966, and consuming 2,575 pages of testimony, special reports, statements, and letters. Most of the discussion, however, affected Title I and the special incentive grant provision. Full reports on the first Title III projects approved, including the full text of Pacesetters in Innovation, were inserted into the record.[2] The issue of state control repreatedly was raised. A document representing USOE answers to policy and procedure questions submitted by Senator Javits was inserted in the record. In these answers, the USOE's position was that the present law was working "reasonably well" and that innovations should not duplicate one another as might be the case if states administered the program.

Commissioner Howe said that the major reason the greatest percentage increase in funds was asked for in Title III was that "it has caught the interest and fired the imagination of the educational community."[3]

Representatives of the Catholic groups were generally pleased with the relationships developing between private and public schools. The Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, however, expressed real concern for USOE's interpretation of the "dual enrollment" provision. They felt that the provisions allowed instruction on private school facilities.

---

[1] U.S. Congress, Senate, Hearings, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1966, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, 1966, Parts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

[2] Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Pacesetters in Innovation, Description of First Projects Approved, (Washington: USOE, February, 1966).

[3] Ibid., p. 600.

Both the House and Senate hearings contain a report prepared by the USOE on "Operation of Title III, ESEA." This step-by-step analysis explains fully the decision-making process regarding the approval of Title III proposals.[1]

A table showing how the 70 first-round operational projects fell into program activity categories provided in ESEA Section 303(b) also is in the Senate report.[2]

House Hearings, 1967[3]

The entire Committee on Education and Labor sat for the hearings on the 1967 ESEA amendments. Though the only urgent business before the Congress that year concerning ESEA was the continuation of the inclusion of Indian children in Title III, the Committee explored fully the several questions bothering certain members since ESEA's passage.[4] Congresswoman Green and Congressman Quie questioned Secretary Gardner and Commissioner Howe extensively on the federal role in Title III, citing evidence presented by the Council of Chief State School Officers that the states with "informal" state plans had superior projects.[1] Several times, the unique role of a federal agency was presented, but to no avail. Only Congressman Brademas made any significant attempt to present the case for USOE administration. It was obvious, too, that Commissioner Howe was resigned to the state turn-over. His only plea was for a federal share to be reserved for projects in the national interest.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 2485-2496.

[2] Ibid., p. 2488.

[3] U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Education and Labor, Hearings, Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967 on H.R. 6230, 90th Congress, 1st Session, 1967.

[4] The authorization level for Title III was established in the previous session.

Senate Hearings, 1967[2]

The Subcommittee already was concerned with new legislative proposals when it took up the extension of portions of ESEA on May 25, 1967. Congressman Quie attended, following a victory for his amendments on the floor of the House, May 24, 1967, to present his arguments for state administration of Title III.[3] Senator Yarborough defended a direct federal role in Title III, using testimony from a Pontiac, Michigan superintendent who said that he preferred federal rather than state administration. The labor unions also testified for Title III's continuation at USOE. Senate support for a direct USOE role in Title III was stronger than House support. No facts or evidence were presented that had not been presented by the House hearings in one form or another. Hearings continued until September 18.

---

[1] Information used in the CSSO papers came from a staff memorandum developed in USOE.

[2] U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Hearings, Education Legislation, 1967 on S. 1125 and H.R. 7819, 90th Congress, 1st Session, 1967.

[3] U.S. Congressional Record, 90th Congress, 1st Session, 1967.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967[1]

This print contains the full text of the ESEA, as amended, with the President's statement on the signing of H.R. 7819. It also contains allocation tables for Title III and a summary of all amendments to the Act. Its significance to the purposes of this study, however, lies in the inclusion of a position paper on state advisory councils under Title III. The Senate was particularly concerned at the time that these state councils should function in such a manner as to keep politics and geography to a minimum in the evaluation of proposals for funding.

House Hearings, 1969[2]

The hearings on ESEA following the election of a Republican President began to reveal the policies of the new Administration. A major controversy developed around the length of program extension, with Republicans generally favoring a two-year, and the Democrats, a five-year extension.

The move toward "consolidation" of programs also picked up momentum, as Secretary Finch proposed putting several state-plan programs together. His proposal matched the "block grant" approach that had been acquiring some Congressional support during previous years. Finch had accurately read the intent of Title III. In testimony he said:

---

[1] U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Committee Print, Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967 with Background Materials and Tables (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968), 210 p.

[2] U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Education and Labor, Hearings, Extension of Elementary and Secondary Education Program, 91st Congress, 1st Session, 1969, parts 1, 2, 3, and 4.

> These PACE projects were intended to provide new innovative thrusts into the educational process, with successes to become models for general application. The purpose is critically important; after three years and one major administrative turn (from local to predominately state control,) I doubt that we can truly measure Title III's impact. I think the program should definitely be continued, with a special eye, however, to retaining the 'model building' emphasis. Once a model has been shaped and perfected, its future funding should not constitute a drain on Title III's seed money.[1]

Brademas inserted into the Record the entire text of his speech at the Middle Atlantic Dissemination Conference, January 28, 1969, where he reminded state officials that Title III was "designed to fill the need for stimulating imaginative, creative, and better ways of educating children."

As the Record now shows, the House moved on to pass a "Consolidation Act" April 23, 1969.

Guidelines for Title III

Since the signing of ESEA, April 11, 1965, four versions of the Guidelines for administering the Title III program have been issued. The first issue, sent as a draft to the chief state school officers, September 6, 1965, was entitled simply Guidelines. Following the meeting of the first advisory committee on Title III, September 23 and 24, the Guidelines were revised to give priority to innovation, which, as has been pointed out previously, was the way Keppel planned to give the program a "quality" dimension. The policy on "low priority" for construction projects also was included in the second version. The first Guidelines were not printed; however state educational agencies were asked by USOE to reproduce the publication and distribute copies to potential local applicants. The Guidelines, also contained the format for the official application to the USOE for a grant.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 2804.

The Guidelines were revised again in 1966 to cast Title III in the strategy for change adapted from Egon Guba's change model.[1] Differentiation was also made between "innovative and exemplary programs" and "educational service centers." Priority was announced for projects contributing to the invention and demonstration stages of the innovative process. Teacher participation was also stressed as important in the development of a project proposal.

Because the larger and wealthier urban centers, with development and research staffs typically produce more and better proposals, the USOE cooperated with the Department of Rural Education to produce a special rural-oriented manual to stimulate rural applicants.[2] This manual was widely distributed by DRE and may well account for the fact that 25 per cent of participants were pupils from rural areas, a reasonably fair level. The manual used the "cookbook" approach, giving step-by-step procedures and providing three examples of completed rural proposals.

A May, 1967, version of the Guidelines, now entitled

---

[1] Supra., p. 4.

[2] Department of Rural Education, A Guide for Developing PACE (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966).

A Manual for Project Applicants and Grantees, reflected the 1966 amendments to the Act and emphasized national priorities. These priorities were (1) improving educational opportunities, (2) planning for metropolitan areas, (3) meeting the needs of rural communities, and (4) coordinating all community resources.

Slight changes also were made in the section on "Participation of children and teachers from private, nonprofit schools." Regarding facilities, for example, the 1967 Guidelines stated that, "Service may be provided on private school premises only when it is not feasible to provide such services on public premises." The provision for including representatives of private schools in the planning phase was changed from "should" to "must."

Major changes, of course, were required in the Guidelines following enactment of the 1967 Amendments. A new manual was written for administering the State Plan portion of Title III. The final draft was issued February 7, 1969. The State Plan Guidelines still retained the emphasis on change strategies and "innovation process" of previous editions. Gone was the emphasis on specific national priorities, since states must assess their own needs. Strong emphasis was put on a comprehensive "learner-need" centered state assessments. Again, a project period of not more than three years was strongly recommended.

A special effort was also made to tie evaluation and dissemination together in a diffusion strategy for educational innovations.

Literature on Title III Evaluation

Unlike most federal programs, Title III in its original form, P.L. 89-10, had no specific provision requiring a report to Congress on the program's effectiveness. This oversight was rectified in the Amendments of 1967.[1] However, the USOE was fully aware that the mere absence of such a provision would not deter "hard" questions from educators and legislators as to whether the program was having the desired effect on American education. Therefore, continuous analysis was undertaken by USOE staff, and more than 150 reports were generated. Several of these operational analyses will be reviewed in this section. In addition, three comprehensive analyses were made by outside experts on a contractual basis. These will be reviewed, as well as the doctoral dissertation of a graduate student at St. John's University, New York.

Status Reports - ESEA Title III[2]

This report summarizes data in table form for the four years of operation of Title III. It includes numbers and dollar amounts of projects submitted and approved in fiscal years 1966 through 1969. Data is also included on number of currently active projects. Table 1, pages 39 and 40, and Table 2, page 41, show that of 6,727 proposals received during the four years, 2,840 were approved by USOE for funding. The approved proposals

---

[1] U.S. Congress, Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967, H.R. 7819, Public Law 90-247, 90th Congress, 2nd Session, 1967, Section 305(c) and (d).

[2] Status Report - ESEA, Title III by Analysis Section, Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers, USOE, March 7, 1969.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF TITLE III PROJECTS SUBMITTED AND APPROVED BY FISCAL YEAR

ITEM	TOTAL PROJECTS[1]		PLANNING PROJECTS		OPERATIONAL PROJECTS	
	Number of Projects	Amount of Funds Requested[2]	Number of Projects	Amount of Funds Requested	Number of Projects	Amount of Funds Requested
Projects Submitted						
FY 1966	2,706	$249,683.5	1,484	$ 73,703.5	1,222	$175,980.0
FY 1967	1,767	260,602.9	451	29,331.9	1,316	231,271.0
FY 1968	1,678	215,472.9	280	18,192.1	1,398	197,280.8
FY 1969	23	3,063.4	9	1,722.4	14	1,341.0
4 Year Total - Regular	6,174	$728,822.7	2,224	$122,949.9	3,950	$605,872.8
Mini-Grants Submitted						
FY 1967	540	11,616.8				
FY 1968	13	291.3				
Cumulative Total (4 Year Total and Mini-Grants)	6,727	$740,730.8				

TABLE 1--Continued

ITEM	TOTAL PROJECTS		PLANNING PROJECTS		OPERATIONAL PROJECTS	
	Number of Projects	Amount of Funds Requested	Number of Projects	Amount of Funds Requested	Number of Projects	Amount of Funds Requested
Projects Approved						
FY 1966	1,085	$ 86,854.0	665	$ 35,464.7	420	$ 51,389.3
FY 1967	935	115,443.3	247	15,797.9	688	99,645.4
FY 1968	582	72,281.3	80	5,501.5	502	66,779.8
FY 1969	6	430.8	1	24.6	5	406.2
4 Year Total - Regular	2,608	$275,009.4	993	$ 56,788.7	1,615	$218,220.7
Mini-Grants Approved						
FY 1967	224	4,818.3				
FY 1968	8	184.7				
Cumulative Total (4 Year Total and Mini-Grants)	2,840	$280,012.4				

---

[1] Data based on Notifications to Congress through February 5, 1969.

[2] Amount in thousands.

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF TITLE III PROJECTS OPERATING BY FISCAL YEAR

Fiscal Year	Number Currently Active[1]	Number Terminated
1966	328	757
1967	690	469
1968	563	27
1969	6	0
Total	1,587	1,253

[1] Active as of March 7, 1969.

called for a total of approximately $280,000,000. As of February 5, 1969, 1,587 projects were active, and still operating. The significance of this data lies in the fact that 58 per cent of all projects received by USOE were not funded. This tends to support the fact that Title III was, as Ralph Becker, Director of the USOE Division of State Plans and Supplementary Centers, often stated, "Fifty state contests in which local school districts were competing for a limited amount of available funds to try their particular innovation."[1] This competitive factor would tend to assure progress toward achieving one of the three purposes ascribed to Title III by Commissioner Francis Keppel in his statement to the House Subcommittee on Education, that Title III was ". . .to stimulate progress toward achievement of higher quality education by providing better services than are currently available."[1]

---

[1] Interview with Ralph J. Becker, May 1, 1969.

Analysis of Projects by Project Category[2]

This report deals with projects approved for the first, second, and third submission periods established by USOE during the first fiscal year, 1966, the same projects covered by the survey in this study. The USOE categorized the projects in five general areas: (1) Multi-purpose projects, (2) Special programs, (3) Administration and Personnel, (4) Subject matter, and (5) Others. Additional breakdowns are provided in each category. Of 294 operational projects, 122 were for media centers, supplemental and learning centers, cultural enrichment programs, demonstration programs, and mobile services. Only 48 were in subject matter areas such as sciences, languages, arts, and others. See Table 3, page 43, for further breakdowns on operational projects. This data is significant because most of these projects were surveyed in this study.

Highlights from the Second Year of PACE[3]

This seven-page report compares the projects funded during the first fiscal year with projects funded during the second year. The following were among the findings which

---

[1] U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Education and Labor, Hearings, Aid to Elementary and Secondary Education, Part I, 89th Congress, 1st Session, 1965, p. 94.

[2] Analysis of PACE Proposals by Project Category, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd periods, R-21, by Analysis Section of DPSC, USOE, September 2, 1966.

[3] Highlights from the Second Year of PACE, by the Analysis Section, DPSC, USOE, August 10, 1967.

TABLE 3

NUMBER OF OPERATIONAL PROPOSALS APPROVED BY CATEGORIES, FISCAL YEAR 1966

Project Categories	n	Amount
1. Multiple Purpose Projects	122	$12,482,251
Media and Materials Centers	33	3,862,340
Supplemental and Learning Centers	31	3,965,436
Cultural Enrichment Programs	28	2,138,258
Demonstration Programs	21	2,088,016
Mobile Services	9	428,201
2. Special Programs	87	8,028,624
Curriculum Development	11	1,137,778
Guidance, Counseling, Testing	17	1,228,905
Self-Instruction	6	457,663
Special Education	13	1,345,610
Outdoor Education	11	808,793
Remedial Instruction	22	2,611,999
Pre-School Education	7	437,876
3. Administration and Personnel	34	2,395,305
Teacher Inservice Training	13	1,335,690
Administration	3	277,646
Team Teaching	3	104,929
Teachers Aides	2	212,908
Computer Processing	12	409,132
Community Resources	1	55,000
4. Subject Matter	48	3,012,307
Science and Mathematics	15	1,211,710
Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences	23	1,014,946
Language Arts	8	752,000
Foreign Languages	2	33,651
5. Others	3	274,825
Total	294	$26,193,312

resulted from this analysis.

1. In fiscal 1966, the average proposal requested $92,000, while the average proposal in fiscal 1967 requested $142,000. This escalation is accounted for by the fact that 55 per cent of the projects approved in fiscal year 1966 were for planning as opposed to only 25 per cent in fiscal year 1967. Planning proposals typically requested smaller amounts than operational proposals.
2. Another finding, which may have significance for those who may wish to analyze fiscal year 1967 continuations, was the fact that a greater percentage of the proposals received in fiscal year 1967 were approved than those received in fiscal year 1966. This, possibly, may be explained by the fact that many operational projects funded in 1967 were preceded by planning grants, which may have tended to increase their quality.
3. An analysis of the projects according to geographic areas showed that the four regions, North, South, Middle West, and West had about the same per cent of proposals approved. Differences were noted in fiscal year 1967, but these were probably accounted for by the higher volume of proposals in some states as related to the availability of funds.
4. When proposals were categorized according to size of the applicant school district, it was revealed that the proposals were fairly evenly distributed

among the various-sized school districts.

5. Based on information in applications, 10,000,000 pupils were served by projects funded in fiscal year 1966, and 7,000,000 in fiscal year 1967. Of these, 36 per cent in 1966 and 22 per cent in 1967 were for secondary school level pupils.
6. In the first year of the program, 12 per cent of the pupils served were in nonpublic schools.

The USOE staff and the outside experts read all proposals to determine their recommendations for funding. The criteria used to judge proposals were as follows:[1]

1. Extent to which proposed project is designed to meet the educational needs of the highest priority.
2. Adequacy of evidence that proposed project will supplement regular school program.
3. Extent to which the project would contribute to the solution of important educational problems.
4. Extent to which procedures to be used in achieving objectives are appropriate, adequate, and efficient.
5. Extent to which proposed program is innovative (presents a new solution to an educational problem) OR
6. Extent to which proposed program is exemplary (has major features which have been proven to be of the highest quality and would serve as a model for the

---

[1] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, A Manual for Project Applicants, Title III Elementary and Secondary Education Act, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 82.

educational community.

7. Adequacy of representation of other educational and cultural resources and of teachers and other school personnel in planning and implementing project activities, according to documentation.
8. Adequacy of planning for proposed project.
9. Degree of awareness of similar programs, research findings, or the knowledge of recognized experts.
10. Economic feasibility and efficiency of proposed project.
11. Extent to which proposed project seems to appropriately involve children in private nonprofit schools.
12. Extent to which provisions for evaluating the proposed project are appropriate and adequate, and provide for a reasonable degree of objectivity.
13. Extent to which provisions for dissemination of information about the proposed program are appropriate and adequate.
14. Suitability of the size and qualifications of the staff.
15. Adequacy and appropriateness of the facilities, equipment, and materials to be used for the proposed project.

A comparison of ratings between 1966 and 1967 showed significant improvement in meeting three criteria: (1) awareness of similar programs, (2) adequacy of evaluation provisions, and (3) adequacy of dissemination provisions. However, though there was improvement, the ratings on the proposals still were consistently low on provisions for evaluation, dissemination, and awareness of similar programs and research throughout the three-year history of the program.

One Hundred Examples of PACE Projects[1]

The first project approvals had no more been announced when the press, publishers of periodicals, and other media sources began asking the USOE for examples of outstanding projects. The USOE attempted to resist selecting one program over another for publicity purposes, but circumstances finally forced the DPSC to compile a list to serve "as examples." The *Croft Federal Aid Service*, using this listing of 100 projects for an article on "exemplary programs," noted the reluctance as follows: "The Washington officials do not say categorically that they were compiling a list of the best, but that is the clear implication."[2]

The fact is that the projects in this report are the result of subjective judgments as to the most innovative projects made by program managers who had read all proposals for their area as well as all of the outside and internal reviews by experts in the projects' fields of activity, and who had negotiated with the project staffs on details of program content. In many cases, they also had visited the site of the project.

---

[1] *One Hundred Project Examples of PACE Projects Selected by Nine Area Desks*, Innovative Centers Branch, DPSC, SR-67-101, 1967.

[2] *The Croft Federal Aid Service*, October 15, 1968, No. 60, p. 1.

Since innovation is admittedly a relative concept, these judgments by well-read and knowledgeable persons with a national perspective on educational developments are probably the best that can be hoped for in terms of what is "innovative." Fifty-two of the 100 "best" projects had been approved in fiscal year 1966 and, therefore, were included in the population for this study. Analysis will be made to determine if the most innovative projects were more successful than others and to see if, as a category, they had different characteristics. These innovative projects answering the survey are identified in Appendix D, which includes abstracts of all projects responding to the questionnaire.

A Report to the States at the Beginning of the Fourth Year of PACE[1]

This report was developed in chart form for a presentation at a conference of representatives of state educational agencies that assumed direct administration of 75 per cent of the projects as of July 1, 1968.[2] Among the data presented were these:

1. Of 1,800 active projects, 1,000 became state administered, 600 were terminated, and 200 were continued under USOE's guidance throughout fiscal year 1969.

---

[1] A Report to the States As We Begin the Fourth Year of PACE, by the Program Analysis Section, DPSC, USOE, (March, 1969).

[2] President's National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services, Conference on Innovation, September 30 - October 2, 1968, p. 19.

2. Of about 10,000,000 pupils participating in projects in fiscal year 1969, 1,128,000, or 12 per cent, were from nonpublic schools.
3. Data was also included as to numbers of projects, amount of funds, and participation in various areas. For example, early childhood had projects costing $12,000,000; handicapped, $26,000,000; individualized instruction, $37,000,000; minority group programs, $6,000,000.

PACEreports[1]

Continual independent analysis was also conducted by the staff of the PACEreport, a periodical indirectly funded by the USOE to report to Title III project personnel and others on administrative developments and results of Title III evaluations. The reports were developed through a grant to Owensboro City Schools, Kentucky; were continued by direct contract with Dr. Richard I. Miller, Director of the University of Kentucky's Program on Educational Change; and, finally, adopted and funded by the President's National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services.[2] In addition to administrative developments various issues of the publication reported on such topics as "Dissemination" (March, 1968), "Evaluation" (November, 1967), "Innovation" (October, 1967), "Inservice Education" (April, 1968), "Urban Education" (May-June, 1968), "Rural Education"

---

[1] PACEreport (Lexington, University of Kentucky).

[2] U.S. Congress, Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967, loc. cit., Section 309.

(July-August, 1968), "Minority Group Education" (September, 1968).

Catalyst for Change: A National Study of ESEA Title III (PACE)[1]

This rather prestigious study was funded by USOE through a grant to the University of Kentucky to solicit expert advice as to the operation of Title III after one year. The advice came in the form of recommendations by 20 educational leaders who reviewed proposals funded by USOE from the perspective of their particular subject-area expertise.

Richard I. Miller, director of the study, cited these five basic purposes for the study:

> to analyze and appraise the proposals approved . . .to look for 'gaps' where selected areas seem to be going and where the approved projects are pointed; to study the overall direction and development of PACE; to view Title III in the broader context of trends in American education; and to study interrelationships of PACE to the various ESEA titles and other programs.[2]

William M. Alexander, University of Florida and Hilda Taba (deceased), San Francisco State College, reviewed the area of "Curriculum Development;" Harold Spears, Superintendent of San Francisco Unified School District, "Community Participation;" Everett M. Rogers, Michigan State University, "Rural Schools and Communication;" Thomas F. Pettigrew, Harvard University, "Urban and Metropolitan Consideration; with Special Focus on

---

[1] U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Notes and Working Papers. Catalyst for Change: A National Study of ESEA, Title III (PACE), 90th Congress, 1st Session, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office), 1967.

[2] *Ibid*., p. xiii.

Civil Rights;" Norman D. Kurland, New York State Education Department, "Roles of the State;" Glen Heathers, New York University, "Individualized Instruction;" Arthur A. Hitchcock, State University of New York, "Pupil Personnel Services;" A. Harry Passow, Columbia University, "The Gifted and the Disadvantaged;" Samuel A. Kirk, University of Illinois, "Handicapped;" Howard Conant and Elliot W. Eisner, Stanford University, "The Arts and Cultured Enrichment;" Paul T. Brandwein, Harcourt, Brace and World Publishers, "Science and Related Areas;" Harold B. Gores, Educational Facilities Laboratories, "Educational Facilities;" Don Davies, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, "Teacher Education;" Egon G. Guba, Indiana University, "Evaluation and the Process of Change;" James D. Finn, University of Southern California, "Educational Technology and Innovation;" Ira J. Singer, West Hartford, Connecticut Public Schools, "Educational Technology and Regulations;" Don Bushnell, Brooks Foundation, "Computer Technology;" and George E. Blair, South Carolina ETV Network, "Educational Television."

Other special reports were prepared, including an excellent analysis of Title III development from the point of view of the political scientist by Doris Kearns, a White House Fellow at the time.[1]

The listing of names and subject areas was included here to (1) indicate the enormous range of programs possible under Title III, and (2) demonstrate the kind of nationally recognized talent the concept of Title III attracted. As Dr. Miller noted, "Title III became the rallying point for the dynamic and ambitious."[1] Miller wrote that:

---

[1] All titles and affiliations of the persons listed were those at the time of the study, 1967.

> Almost all of the 20 special consultants were quite laudatory about the overall accomplishments of PACE during its first year, and they were optimistic about even greater accomplishments in the future.[2]

Thomas Pettigrew wrote, "Only in America do we find national legislation explicitly to foster innovation and change in education as goals in themselves."[3]

The 418 first-year projects were analyzed by Miller's staff and recorded in several of 335 possible activity categories. A summary showed that "Adopting new methods," was recorded as an activity in 81 per cent of the 418 projects. Inservice education was in 77 per cent. Miller said that there was very little evidence of appropriate and required involvement of community resources.

He noted, however, that:

> Certainly one and two additional years will be required before hard data evidence can be gathered with respect to concrete evidence of PACE's contribution to national educational improvement. At present, abundant soft evidence (case studies, surveys, field visitations) leads to the strong belief in Title III's small but vital catalytic role in raising the standard of education at various places.[4]

Reviewing the reports of the 20 consultants and the findings of a survey of 723 project directors, Miller made several recommendations addressed to "identified problem areas": (1) defining innovation, (2) better evaluation at local level, (3) more visits by USOE personnel to projects with budgets of $150,000 or more, (4) state centers for dissemination, (5) more demonstrations of outstanding programs, (6) closer relationships with Title III and I at local and federal levels, but with Title III keeping its "creative nature," and (7) because of shortage of qualified personnel, make better use of Title III personnel.[1]

---

[1] U.S. Congress, Senate, loc. cit., p. 31.

[2] U.S. Congress, Senate, loc. cit., p. 27.

[3] U.S. Congress, Senate, loc. cit., p. 153.

[4] U.S. Congress, Senate, loc. cit., p. 34.

Several dilemmas were cited with recommendations to resolve them as follows:[2]

1. The USOE should avoid being a passive recipient of proposals and become an active stimulator and solicitor.
2. Innovativeness should be considered above "local need" in approvals.
3. A national strategy should be developed.
4. A commitment to continue the project should not be required of the local educational agency because this would inhibit the right of some projects to fail.
5. States should be given four per cent for administration, development, stimulation, and dissemination, but the Federal government should have responsibility for direct administration

---

[1] U.S. Congress, Senate, loc. cit., pp. 35-71.

[2] U.S. Congress, Senate, loc. cit., pp. 73-87.

6. Classroom teachers should be able to receive individual grants of under $10,000 for creative ideas.
7. Regional centers should focus upon the "process of dissemination" of educational innovations.
8. Title III should be funded at the $2,200,000,000 level by fiscal year 1972.

Given the fact that one year is much too short a time for any evaluation based upon achievement of objectives such as Title III's, the USOE was pleased with the national study team's efforts. The Senate Subcommittee on Education was impressed, too, and ordered the report printed as a committee report. The study was liberally quoted during subsequent Congressional debates as to the advisability of turning over the administration of Title III to the states. Dr. Miller and others on the team, however, felt that they had failed to make their point when the House and Senate amended the Title in 1967 to give the states direct control of project approval.[1]

Second National Study

The team was requested by Associate Commissioner for Elementary and Secondary Education, Nolan Estes, to undertake a second study on Title III, using an approach similar to that of the first year study, but with a greater emphasis upon evaluation. Five major reports were produced entitled:[2] (1) Evaluation and PACE, (2) PACE: Catalyst for Change, (3) The Views of 920 PACE Project Directors, (4) Analysis and Evaluation of 137 ESEA Title III Grants, and (5) A Comprehensive Model for Managing an ESEA Title III Project from Conception to Culmination.

---

[1] Also based on conversations with team members at various times during past year.

[2] A Sixth Statement, The Continuation and Strengthening of Title III, Report No. 2, was a memorandum from Title III National Study Team to Commissioner Howe, March 21, 1968.

The first report was completed on February 29, 1968, and four subsequent reports were issued November 10, November 15, November 20, and November 29, 1968.

Evaluation and PACE

The 19 member study team for this report and for PACE: Catalyst for Change, Report No. 6, included 11 of the same experts who were on the previous study team. Added were Glenn Blough, University of Maryland for science; Lloyd M. Dunn, George Peabody College, for special education; Dorothy Fraser, Hunter College for social studies; Robert J. Havighurst, Fordham University for urban, metropolitan, and rural educational development; Maurice Hillson, Rutgers University, for organizational design; John W. Letson, Atlanta, for school-community relations; Joseph B. Rubin, teacher, Portland, Oregon, for classroom perspective; and Robert Stake, University of Illinois, for evaluation design. Special advisors included Harold Gores, Educational Facilities Laboratories, New York, N.Y.; Don Johnson, California State Department of Education; and Daniel L. Stufflebeam, The Ohio State University. A Title III project director's advisory group also was added. The grant for the study was made to Fairfax County Schools, Virginia, as part of a Title III project entitled "Center for Effecting Educational Change." The objective of this study was to judge the adequacy of evaluation procedures and design in Title III projects. Each consultant was asked to read at least 10 proposals and a total of 379 were examined. The consultants identified several major problems in the evaluation of projects and Miller made the following recommendations based on their findings:

1. Projects should have identifiable and specific objectives.
2. Evaluation should be related to these objectives.
3. Each project budget at least five per cent of its total budget for evaluation.
4. USOE should strengthen project assessment, develop materials on the theory and practice of evaluation, and provide assistance to locals in designing projects.

In a special report, Guba recommended (1) a national laboratory for the study of evaluation, (2) a national information center for education, and (3) a national graduate school for educational evaluation.

According to Miller, however:

> One should consider the evaluation weakness of PACE in the general context of American education. Evaluation is also very weak in ESEA Title I proposals, and philanthropic foundations have done little in this area. Blame for evaluation deficiencies of PACE rest with larger deficiencies and shortcomings found in the PACE proposals and projects, and reflect the larger dimension.[1]

PACE: Catalyst for Change[2]

This final report of the Second National Study of Title III featured reports by 17 consultants who were asked to "view the future" of the program from the vantage point of their own speciality. Most of the members had also been on the First National Study team and, together, had studied close to 1,000 proposals and had visited approximately 300 projects.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 22.

[2] PACE: Catalyst for Change, Report No. 6, of the Second National Study of PACE, November 29, 1968, (unpublished).

Alexander suggested three priorities for Title III: (1) support for projects to evaluate innovative practi[illegible] [illegible]n curriculum, (2) emphasis on developing curric[illegible] [illegible]nt and evaluation specialists, and (3) establishme[illegible] [illegible]work of curriculum development and evaluation centers.

Eisner stated that cultural arts programs should not be "add ons" but that they become "institutionalized," and that such programs not try to reach too many but, rather, they should do a better job demonstrating with more intensified programs.

Dunn's blueprint for using the 15 per cent special education share of Title III included "experimentation with boarding schools," "educational diagnosis," "curriculum development," "vertical professional teams," and "very early childhood education."

Hitchcock said that Title III's influence in education could best be shaped by (1) developing large-scale and multi-school projects in the pupil personnel services, (2) conducting a continuing national seminar on counseling for the disadvantaged, and (3) creating a "regeneration agent" outside the established institution to revitalize counselor education.

Blough, noting that the projects he examined dealt mostly with "fringe problems" in the sciences, recommended that "innovations" not be distorted to mean "unusual" or "not pressing." He suggested teacher-involvement need surveys, built-in teacher training in all projects, emphasis on evaluation, and the requirement for new applicants to demonstrate familiarity with new practices and research in the field.

Fraser, after reviewing current trends in social studies, recommended giving priority to (1) experimental curriculum studies, (2) pilot projects for new social studies curricula for ghetto schools, (3) projects to help youth cope with basic conflicts in American society, and (4) inservice education for social studies teachers.

Hillson noted that attempts to break with the graded school curriculum seem to be "rather intense" in Title III projects. However, he noted a lack of real consideration of what is required to implement the changes implicit in such an effort. He recommended that "taxonomies of readiness" first be established at the classroom level and, then, on school-wide basis. He said that projects involving school organization activities should "minimize the length of time for studying a program type and maximize those activities concerned with strategies for operation."

Passow noted, with some reservations, that Title III projects were on the "cutting edge" of developments in the field of the disadvantaged. Suggesting that PACE be focused on urban and the impoverished rural areas, he recommended stressing four critical areas: staff development, curriculum development, community development, and comprehensive and continuing programs.

He found a few of the Title III proposals "highly creative" and "substantive" and "a sufficient basis for optimism for the future."

Rubin, an elementary school teacher, noted that "classrooms should promote the "becoming process," giving adequate "life space" to each individual. He said that projects which put emphasis on outcomes, achievement, and expected conformity prevent some PACE projects from having a "cutting edge" dimension. He recommended greater effort by USOE to disseminate results of projects.

Bushnell, suggested that computer-assisted instruction (CAI) be kept on an experimental basis for the next few years. He said that PACE projects should deal with new developments in language instruction, vocational education, scheduling, and facilities planning.

Singer emphasized the role of the state advisory councils in continuing the creative thrust of Title III. This role included assuring that Title III was: (1) venture capital for experimentation, (2) encouragement to form neighboring consortiums and regional arrangements, and (3) assistance in mounting demonstrations. He said that supplementary centers should be designed to serve as communications centers with video banks and as a service to schools in research and planning.

Letson, as a superintendent, reviewed the program with his mind on the New York City crises and its implications for school-community relations. He noted that too many Title III services are not considered an integral part of the ongoing school program and were "designed to permit their discontinuance without serious consequences." He recommended that projects be designed to incorporate funds from several sources. Title III should be used for (1) the expansion of facilities after school hours, and (2) for a "county agent-home demonstration agent approach to vocational needs." He also was concerned with local-state-federal relationships, noting that it is still more fruitful to work to change the Establishment than to try to circumvent it. He was not alarmed by the fact that under state administration, "there is a natural tendency to spread Title III funds to assure participation by all school systems," citing the need for stimulating all schools to innovate. He was the only Title III evaluator who recommended removing the USOE restriction against funds for building construction.

Havighurst, more than the other consultants, addressed his recommendations to state educational agencies. He recommended a state commissioner on educational development, outside of the state educational agency, to assure that "quasi-permanent programs" would not be funded at the expense of experimentation. States might create an association of educational innovation made up of state agencies in less urbanized states in order to achieve cooperation in the stimulation of innovation. For the state Title III programs, he suggested: (1) small experimental projects carried on by teams that would demonstrate in needed areas such as the arts and humanities; (2) state help to locals to assist them in installing innovations; (3) partial state financial support to supplementary educational centers; and

(4) cooperative projects in rural and sparsely settled areas.

Kurland concerned himself with comments on how the Title III program should be evaluated. He suggested that the true test of Title III was whether the funds were spent in a manner to effect "the way the other 80 to 90 per cent of funds spent on education are used." He suggested that the "process" implicit in Title III is the real value of the program, that is, that Title III should help education do the following more effectively: (1) assess needs, (2) write precise educational objectives, (3) design evaluative procedures to test the achievement of objectives, (4) relate budgets to programs, and (5) learn to develop programs cooperatively. Even in the significant number of rejected Title III proposals, he saw value, in that the development and writing activity itself could generate a commitment by the school district to undertake the project with local funds.

Guba's chapter was addressed to suggestions for evaluation guidelines at the state level. He took the position that the reason evaluation is difficult is that educators usually don't understand it. He cited as "nonsense" that achievement levels of children in schools is the way to justify the effectiveness of Title III as a national program or as a state program. For states, he suggested the following overall policies for management of evaluation: (1) Use of outside "evaluation auditors," (2) Selection of appropriate audience for evaluation data, (3) Provision for data feedback to the project, and (4) Establishment of the responsibility for review of project data.

Finn warned that, though the arguments for a systematic evaluation are convincing, the corollary, bureaucratic institutionalization of evaluation, could destroy the innovative possibilities of Title III. He identified five purposes for evaluation: (1) diffusion, (2) checking and adjusting ongoing processes, (3) substantive knowledge, and (4) justification of the entire Title III program.

He questioned the wisdom of seeking to apply one evaluation approach to all Title III projects, arguing that there are "behavioral objectives" and "system objectives," and Title III projects such as media centers do not lend themselves to evaluations on the basis of behavioral objectives. He observed that "a systematization of the Title III evaluation process is a form of planning" which leads to control of human behavior. Casting the entire evaluation movement as an extension of a developing "technostructure" in the U.S., with its emphasis on systems analyses of social problems, he suggested that it could lead to an end of "participatory democracy and freedom of personal expression itself." As an "accommodation" to this movement, however, he suggested a network of regional evaluation centers to assist local educational agencies evaluate on their own terms, with a back-up national board to support these centers.

Stake suggested that the reason almost no one is satisfied with evaluative efforts in Title III--and in all education--is that there is (1) choas in educational terminology, (2) fluctuation and rapid change in educational objectives, (3) confusion as to what and how to evaluate "development" activities, (4) interference with efforts of USOE Title III staff by higher administrative levels, (5) resistance to the "hard data" approach because of undesirable side effects, (6) difficulty in adapting the Programming, Planning, Budgeting System (PPBS) to a federal educational activity, and (7) that there are defects in the Content, Input, Process, and Product (CIPP) evaluation model. However, "When the chips are down," he said, "the old, reliable way. . .continues to be, appoint (sic) a commission or advisory panel." Deploring this approach as "primitive," he nevertheless concludes that:

> The continuation of support for Title III--at this time--must rest on the fact that it is enabling the schools to provide learning opportunities, to innovate, as they otherwise would not, in ways that are generally judged valuable by educationist and layman alike.

Stake presented a model for program evaluation which has as components, "goals," "projects," "tactics," and "outcomes," noting that each of the components have cyclical relationships.

In a final chapter, Miller summarized the findings and recommendations of five reports of the study team.

The Views of 920 PACE Project Directors[1]

The findings in this study are based on a survey questionnaire sent to 1,400 project directors, the entire Title III population at the time of the study. The response was 65.7 per cent. Directors were asked to reply to questions regarding

---

[1] The Views of 920 PACE Project Directors, Report No. 5, the Second National Study of PACE, November 20, 1968, (unpublished).

(1) problems in project operation, (2) federal-state relationships, (3) effectiveness of Title III, and (4) future needs to be met by Title III. Among the more significant findings were that most projects serve pupils directly, though 15 per cent were for planning and 7 per cent were for services to administrators. The "average" project was designated as having the following characteristics:[1]

1. District level operation--------------------74%
2. In cities of 10,000 or more-----------------30%
3. Service to pupils---------------------------42%
4. Serving as a supplementary center-----------54%
5. Budget between $50,000 and $100,000---------25%

Problems that concerned project directors most were "continuation after [federal] funding," "evaluation," "delay in funding," and "getting qualified personnel." Projects in the western states accounted for most of the concern for dissemination as a problem area. Directors did not want geography to be a factor in state approval of projects. There was a strong desire for recognition on the basis of: "innovativeness and creativity," "merits of the proposal," and "needs of the area." Significantly, in light of USOE emphasis, they had no real objection to evaluation on the extent to which the project was moving toward established objectives.

"Direct lines of communications" was cited as the greatest advantage to state administration of Title III. The greatest disadvantage was "politics." Seventy-eight per cent said that federal control was an "exaggerated and largely fictional fear."

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 10.

PACE directors, state coordinators and the special consultants of the Second National Study Group were asked to rate the effectiveness of Title III toward achieving four objectives. As Table 4, page 66, shows, dramatic differences of opinion are evident, with the consultants consistently rating the program lower on all four counts.

Regarding suggestions for the future development of Title III, the directors stressed the necessity for "more funds" and for "continuation beyond three years."

Miller summarized the findings in five recommendations:

1. "Meeting objectives," "need of the area," "innovativeness and creativity," and "merits of the proposal" should be given primary emphasis in evaluating proposals.
2. State advisory councils for Title III should become powerful instruments, themselves, erring on the side of creativity and dynamism rather than passivity and approval.
3. State advisory councils must take every caution against undesirable political interests which can include geographical considerations and patronage.
4. Ways of continuing some PACE projects beyond three years should be found.
5. Substantially greater funds should be appropriated for ESEA Title III.

TABLE 4

RATINGS ON FOUR OBJECTIVES BY DIRECTORS, STATE COORDINATORS, AND CONSULTANTS, NUMBER IN PER CENT CATEGORIES

Objective: PACE Develops Imaginative Solutions to Educational Problems

Group	Percentage of Effectiveness			
	100-75%	74-55%	54-25%	24-0%
PACE directors	72	9	16	4
State coordinators	67	26	0	8
Special consultants	22	11	67	11

Objective: PACE Facilitates Demonstration of Worthwhile Innovations

Group	Percentage of Effectiveness			
	100-75%	74-55%	54-25%	24-0%
PACE directors	66	12	18	4
State coordinators	70	26	4	0
Special consultants	11	11	56	22

Objective: PACE Assists in More Effective Knowledge Utilization

Group	Percentage of Effectiveness			
	100-75%	74-55%	54-25%	24-0%
PACE directors	53	12	26	8
State coordinators	64	16	12	8
Special consultants	0	11	67	22

Objective: PACE Contributes to Development of Supplementary Centers and Services

Group	Percentage of Effectiveness			
	100-75%	74-55%	54-25%	24-0%
PACE directors	57	14	21	8
State coordinators	46	38	15	0
Special consultants	22	44	11	22

Analysis and Evaluation of 137 ESEA Title III Grants[1]

One of the early attempts to secure objective data regarding the operational characteristics of Title III projects was made in this study of 137 Title III projects by a team directed by Miller at the University of Kentucky. All of the official annual reports received by USOE from projects as part of the annual reporting requirements were shipped to Miller, who designed an evaluation instrument and set up a panel to review and judge a 137 sample of the reports. Looking back on their analysis from a 1969 vantage point, portentous findings were revealed in the data. The most revealing was that, of the 137 projects, 92, or almost 70 per cent, gave "consideration to continuation by means other than support by ESEA Title III."[2] Of the operational projects (the population surveyed in this dissertation) the percentage was even higher, 75 per cent. The researchers also judged that almost 50 per cent of these projects were "well planned and likely to succeed." Others were questionable or had provided insufficient data for judgment.

The review panel also gave the following quality rating to the 137 projects:[3]

Rating	Planning	Operational	Total
Outstanding	14	5	19
Good	37	20	57
Average	19	11	30
Poor	18	7	25
Very poor	6	0	6
Total	94	43	137

---

[1] *Analysis and Evaluation of 137 ESEA Title III Planning and Operational Grants, Report No. 4*, the Second National Study of PACE, November 15, 1968, (unpublished, ERIC).

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 39.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 49.

Activities in these projects, most of which were approved in fiscal year 1966, were categorized as follows: planning of programs, 108; planning for construction, 10; conducting of pilot programs, 28; operation of program, 44; construction, 4; and remodeling, 4.

Fifty-one, or about 30 per cent, were single-district programs.

In rating accomplishments on the basis of termination reports, the panel found that 19 operational projects, or 44 per cent, had research-oriented programs or had used research methodology in planning, operational procedures and/or evaluation.

The review team discredited the effectiveness of almost 50 per cent of the claimed dissemination efforts. Evaluation was judged to be "an integral part" of the project in only 20 per cent of the cases. Thirty-seven, or 23 per cent were rated as "much" in degree of adequacy of evaluation procedures.

Nine recommendations were made for future action by the USOE in funding Title III projects:

1. Require evidence of knowledge of local needs.
2. Require all supplementary centers to include a need assessment study.
3. Require better terminal reports.
4. Require more adequate and realistic involvement of community resources.
5. Require more effective evaluation procedures.
6. Include no less than five per cent of the total budget in each project for evaluation.

7. Require more evidence of planning.
8. Require that project provisions for continuation give stronger documentation.
9. Require a commitment of local funds to projects at the ratio of approximately one dollar of local funds to ten dollars of federal money.

PACE: Transition of a Concept[1]

The amendments to ESEA in 1967, in addition to granting direct project management to the state educational agencies, substantially changed the role and responsibility of the Title III advisory council. Among other duties, the council was required to:

> make an annual report of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of the Title) to the President and the Congress. . .[2]

This was the first report by the Council. Much of the findings and evaluation results contained in it were taken from the several parts of the Second National Study of Title III. Miller, director of that study, was now Executive Secretary of the Council. Though the report seemed to give emphasis to recommendations, five major accomplishments also were cited. They were that Title III provided (1) an extended educational conversation, (2) a chance to do something different, (3) an intellectual haven for the dynamic and ambitious, (4) some innovative approaches to old and new problems, and (5) new cooperative arrangements.

---

[1] PACE: Transition of a Concept, the first report of the President's National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services, January 19, 1969, (unpublished).

[2] U.S. Congress, Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments, Public Law 247, 90th Congress, 2nd Session, 1967, Section 309.

Appraising the first two years, the report said that, "It is a fact that hundreds of school systems across the nation have felt differently about education as a result of ESEA Title III."

Some of the 17 recommendations made by the Council were also derived from the findings of the consultants and surveys connected with the Second National Study. The Council raised questions about the advisability of the 15 per cent earmarked by the Law for the handicapped, suggesting that it was a "political" decision. It also suggested a separate budget for the Council and urged states to allow their state advisory councils to "become influential and relatively independent bodies. . ." A project period longer than three years was suggested for some projects.

A Comprehensive Model for Managing an ESEA Title III Project[1]

A tangible product of the Second National Study was this manual for directors of Title III projects. The "model," as Miller called it, is a check list of activities that he felt should be performed during each phase of program management. This includes proposal development; first, second, and third year appraisal, and final appraisal. Included are activities such as the use of a task force, needs assessment, priority setting, and proposal development. Considerations were also included for objective writing, program selection, demonstration and dissemination provisions, guides to implementation, terminal factors, management, relationships, budgeting, facilities, equipment, and materials, evaluation, and required assurances. This study as well as the other reports of the National Study Team are available through Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) of USOE.

---

[1] A Comprehensive Model for Managing an ESEA Title III Project from Conception to Culmination, Report No. 6 of the Second National Study of PACE, November 10, 1968, (unpublished) 90 p.

Conference on Innovation[1]

This is a report of the proceedings of the conference of representatives from state educational agencies, advisory committees, and selected project directors. The conference was called in an attempt to ease the transition of administrative authority for the PACE program from direct control by USOE to the state departments of education. The conference's two major purposes were to relay to state administrators the intent of Congress for Title III and to stress the independence of state advisory committees. Information on evaluation, dissemination, and the new "handicapped" provision in the law was also to be transmitted to participants.

Representative John Brademas, who had opposed giving the program to the states, in his report said that: "community involvement, dissemination and evaluation, meeting Congressional intent--these are the pivotal factors in the success of Title III as a State Plan program."[2]

---

[1] Conference on Innovation: Report by the President's National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services, September 30 - October 2, 1968, (Washington: Bell Educational Services, Inc.), 178 p.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 149.

The conferees made numerous recommendations, most of which were concerned with funding. One particularly significant recommendation was for a five-year project period to encourage "really innovative programs."

A Study of Title III Projects[1]

The topic of this dissertation was suggested by the USOE (the writer). Its purposes were to (1) determine the status of Title III projects following the termination of USOE grants, (2) to ascertain the relationships between these Title III projects and selected variables; and (3) to determine the reason for discontinuance. As can be readily observed, this study is similar to the writer's dissertation in several respects. The major differences are that (1) it deals only with projects which were completed or terminated as of December 1967, and (2) it surveyed the project directors rather than school superintendents. Since the earliest date that any project could become operational was during the second school semester of 1966, the maximum period of time that a project in Polemeni's sample could have been in operation was 22 months. Since most projects had much less time of actual operation, it can be assumed that most of these projects were not operational long enough to be effective demonstrations. Therefore the projects surveyed were probably the early failures. Of 149 projects under study, 120 or 80.5 per cent were discontinued following termination of

---

[1] Anthony John Polemeni, "A Study of Title III Projects, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 83-531 (89-10), After the Approved Funding Periods," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, St. John's University, New York, 1969).

Title III funds; five, or 3.9 per cent, remained in operation following termination of funding for periods ranging from one month to one year, but then became defunct; and 24 or 16.1 per cent, continued in operation following the termination of federal funding and still were in operation as of fiscal year 1968-69, at the time of this study. The researcher suggests two possible interpretations for this low continuation rate: (1) the Title III projects were not innovative or creative and, thus, did not fulfill the "seed money" objective of the legislation; or (2) since Title III was "risk money," a 16 per cent continuation is a good "rate of return," especially if possible side benefits are included. The researcher also suggests that the lower funding level of Title III by Congress may have been a factor in the low rate. However, this inference must be rejected because 688 new operational projects were funded in fiscal year 1967, and 502 in fiscal year 1968.

The study found that there was no association between the status of the project following the termination of federal Title III funds and the variables of (1) type of project; (2) geographic location; (3) size of student population served; (4) amount of total expenditures of Title III funds; and (5) the per cent of school district financial contribution. Project directors rated "inability to absorb the costs" as the primary reason for discontinuance.

A comparison between defunct and continuing projects, according to the researcher, showed that "a local commitment of funds enhances the prospects of continuation of the project after the federal withdrawal of funds."[1]

Dollar expenditures for continuation increased over amounts in initial Title III grants, and there was a substantial drop in the student population served.

The following recommendations were made:

1. A five-year federal financial commitment should be made to the local educational agency.
2. The applicant should be required to be more explicit in "designs for continuation."
3. USOE and state educational agencies should be more selective and fund fewer projects of higher quality.
4. Congress should mandate a local funding commitment which would escalate each year of the project's operation.
5. USOE and state agencies should develop a more effective communications program to give local administrators a clearer view of the difference between Title III and other programs.
6. Title III projects should develop more cooperative working relationship with other agencies such as ESEA Title IV laboratories.
7. A standard project proposal format should be developed by USOE, without periodic changes.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 116.

A Search for New Energy, ESEA Title III[1]

Sixty Title III projects were visited by members of a team of 20 observers selected by the Ford Foundation from among their 1967-68 Washington Interns in Education. The study posed two major questions: "In what educational contexts has Title III already demonstrated effectiveness?" and "How might benefits of Title III be expanded in areas of needed change in American education?" Projects were selected from a universe of 60 Title III projects, rated by USOE as "unsuccessful" or "successful." The study team did not know these ratings during the study. Since projects were not selected at random, the summary of characteristics of projects are not representative, though Table 5, page 76, on costs may be useful for comparison with other such studies.[2]

The report also contained information as to actual number of grant awards made in each fiscal year.[3] For example, though 1,085 proposals were approved by USOE in fiscal year 1966 and, therefore, carry a 1966 identification number, only 707 were actually funded before July 1, 1966. Of these, only 256 were operational projects.

The history chapter in this report was particularly pertinent since it drew upon Guthrie's dissertation, which covered the political controversies surrounding the enactment

---

[1] Charles S. Benson and James W. Guthrie, A Search for New Energy: ESEA Title III, An Essay on Federal Incentives and Local and State Educational Initiative, a report for the USOE under contract through the George Washington University, December, 1968, (unpublished) 68 p.

[2] Ibid., p. 4.

[3] Ibid., pp. 62-64.

TABLE 5

AVERAGE AMOUNT OF TITLE III FUNDS SPENT PER INDIVIDUAL SERVED

Item	Number of Projects	Per Cent of Projects
Less than $3.99	15	25.0
$ 4.00 - 7.99	11	18.4
8.00 - 11.99	3	5.0
12.00 - 15.99	2	3.3
16.00 - 19.99	2	3.3
20.00 - 29.99	3	5.0
30.00 - 49.99	7	11.6
50.00 - 99.99	6	10.0
100.00 and over	11	18.4
Total	60	100.0

of ESEA.[1] He pointed out that ESEA originally was intended to emphasize (1) "Equality" and (2) "Quality," and that "hopes for immediate improvements in the quality. . .centered in Title III."

A chapter is devoted to examples of projects incorporating new approaches in instruction, curriculum, regional cooperation, utilization of technology, evaluation and special education. The authors argue that:

> the likelihood of such significant changes coming about in the absence of outside funding is not great: revenue increments normally available to local school districts are insufficient to create the 'critical resource mass' needed to inaugurate a major innovation. Title III makes sufficient resources available and insulates those resources from selfish spokesmen for the status quo.[2]

---

[1] James W. Guthrie, "The 1965 ESEA: The National Politics of Educational Reform," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1967).

[2] Benson, loc. cit., p. 36.

The sixty projects visited by the team members were analyzed on the basis of 26 variables, using the BCTRY cluster analysis to identify those characteristics which had the highest intercorrelations. Results showed that projects with smaller target groups tended to be more frequently associated with the rating "successful" than did larger target groups. Success was also associated with projects which had "better than average physical facilities," "consulted with other community agencies in planning the project," and "sought information from outside sources prior to and during the operation of the project."

Nine areas in American education were suggested for attention through Title III: (1) systematic planning and evaluating, (2) preparation of personnel, (3) individualization of instruction, (4) massing of resources under metropolitan and regional cooperation, (5) racial integration, (6) preschool programs, (7) education of the gifted, (8) community involvement, and (9) vocational education.

Recommendations included:

1. Funding of Title III at a level equal to at least five per cent of the national expenditure for education.
2. Allocation of 20 to 25 per cent of Title III funds for small locally initiated, "risk-type" projects (as opposed to large exemplary types).
3. Deployment of roughly 30 to 40 per cent in development of experimental and innovative projects of substantial size and state-wide impact.

4. Retention of 15 to 20 per cent of appropriations for administration at the federal level.
5. Endorsement of the Committee for Economic Development's proposal for a National Commission on Research, Innovation, and Evaluation in Education.
6. Creation of a public corporation charged with administration of Title III at the state level similar to California's legislation.
7. Development of state advisory councils with independent staffs.
8. Giving of high priority to assessment of project staff potential in selection of proposals.

Literature on Educational Change

Ronald G. Havelock, in an introduction to his paper, "Dissemination and Utilization, the State of the Art," noted that the growth of literature in the field of educational change in the last decade constituted a "miniature explosion."[1] He identified 4,000 items, but said that probably 8,000 to 10,000 existed. Of these, he said that 53 per cent were "quantitative," 25 per cent "theoretical," and 7 per cent "case studies."

In selecting studies for review from this vast amount of literature, the writer examined Havelock's two bibliographies,

---

[1] Ronald G. Havelock, "Dissemination and Utilization: The State of the Art," paper presented to symposium at the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, February 6, 1969.

Major Works on Change in Education[1] and Bibliography on Knowledge Utilization and Dissemination.[2] He also had in hand the Kurland-Miller, Selected and Annotated Bibliography on the Processes of Change,[3] McClelland's The Process of Effecting Change,[4] Rogers' Bibliography of Research on the Diffusion of Innovation,[5] and ERIC's Documents on Educational Change Processes and Research Utilization.[6] Other references were drawn from the writer's own collection of books, papers, monographs, and journal articles dealing with the general area of dissemination, diffusion, change, or research utilization.

The research studies on change encompass several related disciplines. Most writers in the area of diffusion start with the assumption that just as educators have learned much about how pupils learn from related disciplines, they can learn even more about how to manage the change process from the fields of agriculture, philosophy, medicine, psychology, political science and sociology. Selected studies from these fields therefore are included in the review of literature.

---

[1] Ronald G. Havelock, et al., Major Works on Change in Education: An Annotated Bibliography and Subject Index (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1969).

[2] Ronald G. Havelock, Bibliography on Knowledge Utilization and Dissemination (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1968).

[3] Norman Kurland and Richard Miller, Selected and Annotated Bibliography on the Processes of Change (Albany: New York State Department, 1966).

[4] William A. McClelland, The Process of Educational Change (Washington: The George Washington University, 1968).

[5] Everett M. Rogers, Bibliography on Research on the Diffusion of Innovation (East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1968).

[6] USOE, "ERIC Documents on Educational Change Processes and Research Utilization," a Report on Projects during July, 1966. May, 1968.

The Mort and Cornell study provides a beginning point for most discussion on the rate of diffusion of educational innovation.[1] This study often is quoted concerning how long it takes for schools to adopt a new idea. The finding that it took 50 years before such a "practical invention" as kindergarten to become generally widespread is often used to support a position that educators are conservative and change resistant. These findings also are quoted to support the need for new federal programs, such as Title III and others. Another often quoted conclusion in Mort's study was that cost is the only significant variable affecting the change rate. Not as well known was the finding that, on the average, it takes seven times as long for the first 10 per cent acceptance of an innovation as for the next 40 per cent, and that it takes approximately 15 years before three per cent of the school systems have installed an innovation. Ross, reporting the substantive findings of some 70 studies concerned with the adoption process, reinforced the findings of Mort and Cornell.[2]

Trump and Baynam delved into the reasons why schools do not change more rapidly.[3] One reason, they point out, is that while industry recently changed its ratio of plant-to-tool expenditure by putting more emphasis on tools, education continues to put major emphasis on buildings with tools remaining a minor investment.

---

[1] Paul H. Mort and P.G. Cornell, American Schools in Transition: How Our Schools Adopt Their Practices To Changing Needs, A Study of Pennsylvania (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University Press, 1941).

[2] D.H. Ross, et al., Administration for Adoptability (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University Press, 1951).

[3] J. Lloyd Trump and Dorsey Baynam, Guide to Better Schools: Focus on Change (Chicago: Rand, McNally and Co., 1961).

One of the first studies to challenge Mort's findings was Brickell's Statewide Inventory of Educational Change in New York.[1] He found that the rate of change more than doubled after Sputnik (and after the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, incidentally.) The changes also took place within the existing structural framework of tne school. New textbooks were adopted, contents of courses were changed, honor classes added, and criteria for selection of students for instruction was changed. But the study found that:

> . . .few innovations embodied changes in the kind of pupils employed, in the way they were organized to work together, in the types of instructional materials they used, or in the times and places at which they taught.[2]

Knapp, in a study of Ohio high schools presented findings similar to Brickell's.[3] In surveying curriculum changes in Ohio high schools for a five-year period, 1954-55 to 1958-59, he found many changes, but said that most of them were superficial.

It was Miles' "Agenda for the Study of Innovation," that influenced the design of this dissertation.[1] His "Agenda" included asking questions on the nature of educational innovation, such as: (1) Do educational systems, as such, have special characteristics which affect the extent, rate, and fate of innovations? (2) Are there formal characteristics of an innovation--its complexity, the amount of extra energy its installation is likely to require from system members, its perceived "radicalism", the degree to which it is divisible into simpler parts--which exert critical effects on its progress into the system? (3) Are there conditions which might be characterized as making for "ripeness" of a system, a kind of latent disequilibrium which makes subsequent innovations actually welcome? (4) What, actually, seems to go on as an innovation encounters a system in which someone hopes it will become installed? (5) What sorts of persons or groups characteristically serve as advocates of innovation? (6) What determines whether a particular innovation may or may not be incorporated substantially, as originally envisioned, into the subsequent operations of the target system? (7) Under what circumstances does a system begin to innovate at a different rate than previously?

---

[1] Henry M. Brickell, Organizing New York State for Educational Change, a report to the New York State Department of Education (Albany: State Department of Education, 1961).

[2] Ibid., p. 8.

[3] Dale L. Knapp, "An Evaluative Study of Curriculum Change in Ohio Schools," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, Ohio State University, 1959).

Mort, in a chapter in Miles' book, reports some "overarching findings" from a 50-year perspective.[2] He noted: (1) the rate of diffusion of complex innovations appear to be the same as that for simple innovations, (2) innovations that increase cost move more slowly than those that do not, (3) a community that is slow to adopt one innovation tends to be slow to adopt others, and adversely, (4) explanation of differences in the educational adaptability of communities can be found "in no small degree" in the character of the population. As an interesting aside, Mort suggested that innovations will increase only if educators reject the 19th century principle of "offering opportunity," and adopt the principle that "all children shall learn."[1]

---

[1] Matthew B. Miles, ed., Innovation in Education (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964).

[2] Ibid., pp. 325-326.

In the same book, Griffiths theorized that change in organizations will be expedited by the appointment of outsiders rather than insiders as chief administrators. The hierarchal structure makes innovation from the bottom virtually impossible, he found.[2] Furthermore, the longer the tenure of the chief administrator, the fewer the changes.

However, a study by Ross and Halbower suggests that the only significant variables in the adoption of innovations are intra-system, not extra-system.[3]

It was Miles' "temporary system-concept" for facilitating change that the Title III's three-year demonstration project approach to diffusion fits most neatly.[4] For Miles noted that:

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 325-326. Note: Leon Lessinger, Associate Commissioner in BESE now advocates this concept using the "zero reject terminology."

[2] Ibid., p. 435.

[3] Paul D. Ross and Charles C. Halbower, "A Model for Innovation. Adoption in Public School Districts" (Cambridge: Arthur D. Little, Inc., 1968), mimeographed.

[4] Miles, loc. cit., pp. 485-486.

> Temporary systems provide the opportunity for increased social validation of the desirability of particular innovations, given the uncertainty of outcome measurement and public vulnerability. The risk reduction in temporary systems is thus a very attractive feature for most educational systems.

Miles then concluded that: "the deliberate use of temporary systems open the possibility of a more manageable process of educational change."

Wayland, dealing extensively with the formal organization of local schools, mentioned that: "the schools are essentially bureaucratic structures, and the teacher's role in the system is largely that of a functionary."[1] As such they will probably resist changes, he said.

Among the implications were that innovations which are more difficult to institutionalize are likely to encounter greater resistance, and that "successful innovations are more likely to be achieved when initiated by administrative officials. . .because they are in a position to handle the system problems inevitably associated with innovation in an on-going system."

Sieber's image of the teacher practitioner, who under most conditions is a "powerless participant," tends to support Wayland's suggested strategy.[2]

The literature on change in agriculture has special significance to American education because agriculture is an example of successful and reasonably rapid diffusion of new practices to a geographically diverse and isolated class of practitioners. Though some theorists reject the agricultural model analogy for education, it still has advocates and adopters. Hearn, for example, compares the farmer's preparation of his "seed bed" to the superintendent's preparation and cultivation of his staff and community for change. He suggested Carl Rogers' approach to system change, saying:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 612.

[2] Sam D. Sieber, Images of the Practitioner and Strategies for Inducing Educational Change (New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1967), mimeographed.

> Thus the educator must not only concern himself with learning and curriculum theory and with research in subject areas, but must also become truly the social scientist--a catalyst for change in his community. He must become familiar with the theory and research of dissemination and in particular of small group behavior.[1]

Hearn's article also contains a review of some of the major studies on group behavior and management.

In this same area, Lionberger's summary of research related to acceptance of technological change is a thorough and scholarly resource for a study of change.[2] However, Everett Rogers' Diffusion of Innovations is probably the most practical for the use of students of change in the educational enterprise.[3] Rogers reviewed and synthesized the findings of 506 publications on the diffusion of innovations in the various fields of anthropology, medical sociology, and rural sociology. He identified five stages in the adoption process of value to planners and disseminators. They are as follows:

---

[1] Norman E. Hearn, "Dissemination: After Bangkok, What?" SRIS Quarterly, I, 1968, p. 9.

[2] Herbert F. Lionberger, Adoption of New Ideas and Practices (Ames: The Iowa State University Press, 1960).

[3] Everett M. Rogers, Diffusion of Innovations (New York: The Free Press, 1965).

1. _Awareness stage_. The individual is exposed to the innovation but lacks complete information about it.
2. _Interest stage_. The individual becomes interested in the new idea and seeks additional information about it.
3. _Evaluation stage_. The individual mentally applies the innovation to his present and anticipated future situation.
4. _Trial stage_. The individual uses the innovation on a small scale in order to determine its utility in his own situation.
5. _Adoption stage_. The individual decides to continue the full use of the innovation.

In his research of the literature, Rogers also identified what he called "characteristics of innovation." Five were described as: (1) relative advantage, (2) compatibility, (3) complexity, (4) divisibility, and (5) communicability. He emphasized that these characteristics affect the adoption decision by a social system, but the degree to which each trait effects that decision is directly related to the _individual's_ perception of its existence in the innovation.[1]

Rogers also described the characteristics of five adopter categories of individuals. These were (1) Innovators, who are "venturesome and cosmopolite," (2) Early adopters, who are respected by their peers and are "localites," (3) Early majority adopters, who are more "deliberate" and seldom hold leadership positions, (4) Late majority adopters, who are skeptical and must be pressured by their peers to adopt, and (5) laggards, who are the most localite of all categories, many being near-isolates. These categories have been distributed along curves representing classification as to time required to adopt, as follows: Innovators, 2 1/2 per cent; early adopters, 13 1/2 per cent; early majority adopters, 34 per cent; late majority adopters, 34 per cent; and laggards, 16 per cent.[1]

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 127.

The relatively earlier adopters in a social system tend to be younger, have higher social status, a more favorable financial position, more specialized operations, and a different type of mental ability from later adopters. Earlier adopters utilize information sources that are more impersonal and cosmopolite than later adopters, and that are in closer contact with the origin of new ideas.[2]

In a chapter on the role of the change agent, Rogers suggested the following strategy for change:

1. A program of change should be tailored to fit the cultural values and past experiences.
2. A change agent's clients must perceive a need for an innovation before it can be successfully introduced.
3. Change agents should be more concerned with improving their client's competence in evaluating new ideas, and less with simply promoting innovations, per se.
4. Change agents should concentrate their efforts upon

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 162.

[2] _Ibid._, p. 192.

opinion leaders in the early stages of diffusion of an innovation.

5. The social consequences of innovations should be anticipated and prevented if undesirable.

Of particular interest to researchers of the diffusion process is Rogers' synthesis of attempts to predict innovativeness using statistical techniques. His criteria for selecting variables for correlation with dependent variables are worthy of note:[1]

1. Each independent variable should be highly related to the dependent variable.
2. Each independent variable should have a relatively low interrelationship with each other independent variable.
3. The total number of variables should be minimized because of the amount of computational effort required and to increase practicality.
4. There should be a theoretical and practical relevance for the relationship of each independent variable with the dependent variable.

Carlson conducted a study which traced the life cycles of six innovations in 107 school systems within two states.[2] This highly theoretical work is difficult for the practitioners to interpret. However, summaries of Carlson's findings can be found in two publications, Change Process in the Public Schools[1] and The Administration of Educational Innovation.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 290.

[2] Richard O. Carlson, Adoption of Educational Innovations (Eugene: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1965).

Carlson reported, for example, that a study of adoption of educational practices such as team teaching, modern math, foreign language instruction in the elementary grades, programmed instruction, ungraded primary classes, and accelerated programs in high schools revealed that the amount of money spent per child had a negative, insignificant correlation. He cited three barriers to change: (1) the absence of a change agent, (2) a weak knowledge base, and (3) "domestication" of the public schools; that is, lack of real accountability. Carlson also developed the "S" shaped diffusion curve, which he said is produced by two factors: size of adopter categories, and length of trial period. Woods' small book is probably the most readable and practical summary of research on education available to the practitioner who wants a short introduction to a change theory.

Another good summary of change strategy research can be found in McClelland's The Process of Effecting Change. He noted that "one of the rationales for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was to fund a new complex of educational organizations, a concept at least in part stimulated by the signal success of the Agricultural Extension Service."[1] This publication also contains an easily interpreted version of Rogers' paradigm for inter-organizational research and development.

---

[1] Richard O. Carlson, et. al., Change Process in the Public Schools (Eugene: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1965).

[2] Thomas E. Woods, The Administration of Educational Innovation (Eugene: School of Education, University of Oregon, 1967).

Gallaher, Jr., in Change Processes in the Public Schools introduced the anthropologist's definition of a "culture change cycle."[2] These are (1) innovation, the process whereby a new element of culture or combination of elements is made available to a group; (2) dissemination, the process whereby an innovation comes to be shared; and (3) integration, the process whereby an innovation becomes mutually adjusted to other elements in the system. Linton had noted however, that any interference from external sources can cause changes in status and roles, which in turn may create new problems within society.[3]

The political scientist usually describes change in terms of power struggles. Merriam, for example, says that the primary causes of change are tensions and emergencies.[4] The chief competitors in the area of political change are violence on one side and invention on the other. Catlin, in a scholarly presentation of the science of politics, regarded change and resistance as dichotomous forces.[5]

---

[1] William A. McClelland, The Process of Effecting Change (Washington: Human Resources Research Office, The George Washington University, 1968), p. 11.

[2] Carlson, et. al., loc. cit., p. 40.

[3] Ralph Linton, The Study of Man (New York: Appleton-Century-Croft, Inc., 1936).

[4] Charles Edward Merriam, The Role of Politics in Social Change (Washington Square: New York University Press, 1936).

[5] George Catlin, Systematic Politics (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962).

Psychology's contribution to understanding change is in the areas of understanding human behavior and possible approaches to modifying it for acceptable social goals. Combs and Snygg, for example, pointed out that one's behavior does not depend solely upon external forces to which one is exposed, but rather upon one's own perception of events.[1] Therefore, the authors concluded that change in human behavior is a problem of helping the individual to perceive himself differently in relation to his environment. A study by Lippitt suggested that with the help of professional guidance, change will evolve from a purposeful decision to effect improvement in a personality or social system.[2] Lippitt also discussed six patterns of use for scientific resources emerging from social research to help improve social practice.[3] Carl Rogers recommended a "psychotherapy" in which the client undertakes exploration, analysis, understanding, and proposes new solutions himself.[4] In fact, at the National Seminars on Innovation in Honolulu, Hawaii, 1967, Rogers presented what he called a "practical plan for educational revolution."[5] He said, that since change cannot be imposed upon the individual, the group, or the organization (because change must be "self-directed" and "self-chosen"), an effective instrument for this self-directed change is "the intensive group experience," often called the basic encounter group, the T-group, or the sensitivity-training group.

---

[1] Arthur Combs and Donald Snygg, Individual Behavior (New York: Harper and Bros., 1959).

[2] Ronald Lippitt, "The Use of Social Research to Improve Social Practice," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXXV (July, 1965).

[3] Ronald Lippitt, et al., The Dynamics of Planned Change (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1958).

[4] Carl R. Rogers, Existential Psychology (New York: Random House, Inc., 1961).

[5] Richard Goulet, ed., Educational Change: The Reality and the Promise, a report on the National Seminars, Honolulu, July 2-23, 1967 (New York: Citation Press, 1968), pp. 120-135.

This published report on the above mentioned National Seminars on Innovation has other presentations by eminent consultants which the student of change may wish to pursue. These include, John I. Goodlad, Caleb Gattegno, Harold Gores, James Farmer, Egon Guba, David Krech, and Dwight Allen, to name a few. Another excellent discussion on strategy of effecting change in education is a publication edited by Edgar L. Morphet, reporting on a conference held in Scottsdale, Arizona, April 3-5, 1967, as part of an ESEA Title IV project entitled "Designing Education for the Future."[1] This report abounds in recommendations on the role of various agencies in the innovative process.

One of the most positive reports on the effects of innovation in high schools was the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools follow-up study of a 1967 National Innovation Inventory.[2] An in-depth study of 27 innovations in 22 big schools across the Nation revealed that most innovations seemed to have accomplished what they promised; for example, given time off for preparation, teachers actually used the time in that manner to improve instruction.[1]

---

[1] Edgar L. Morphet and Charles O. Ryan, ed., Planning and Effecting Needed Changes in Education (New York: Citation Press, 1967).

[2] For Inventory of Innovation in 7,237 high schools, see Gordon Cawelti, "Innovation Practices in High Schools," Nation's Schools (April, 1967), reprint.

Another study by NCA on reasons for abandonment of innovations also provided some meaningful insights into the change process. The findings suggested, for example, that "new practices succeed most often when staffs select meaningful innovations which are useful, adaptable, and feasible for their schools. An indiscriminate 'hard sell' by the proponents of an innovation is no substitute for developing a clear, underlying rationale for change."[2]

Several studies attempted to provide insight into the operation of situational and personal characteristic variables upon the adoption of innovations. A study by Childs of eight school districts in Michigan revealed that innovative schools had a larger proportion of "open-belief systems" teachers than did non-innovative school districts.[3] A study by Kohl of Oregon school districts found that "size of school as indicated by the size of the senior class was related to the adoption of each of seven staff utilization practices except teaching by television."[4] It also was evident that the characteristics dealing with "relative advantage," "divisibility," and "compatibility" of innovations were perceived more often than were the characteristics, "communicability" or "complexity" Richland's dissertation at the University of Southern California concluded that there are measurable characteristics of a school district which are empirically related to the innovative behavior of the district.[1] He found that "urbanity," defined as "high school density," significantly correlated with innovational behavior. The highest correlation however was with "highest teacher salary." Two variables, "attitude of the board toward innovation" and "ambition of the superintendent" highly correlated with innovativeness. He found little correlation between innovativeness and "years the superintendent has been a superintendent." Richland claimed to have developed a framework for a collection of useful data, and a tool to be used to analyze the data. "On the bases of analyses," he said, "the probability of success of the introduction of an innovation may be ascertained, and appropriate decisions made."

---

[1] Gordon Cawelti, "Does Innovation Make a Difference?" Nation's Schools (November, 1968), reprint.

[2] North Central Association, Today, May, 1967, p. 1.

[3] John W. Childs, "A Study of Belief Systems of Administrators and Teachers in Innovative and Non-Innovative School Districts" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965).

[4] John W. Kohl, "Adoption Stages and Perceptions of Characteristics of Educational Innovations" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oregon, 1965).

Christie, in a study of sixteen school districts, found that perception of innovativeness by board members was the strongest predictor of district innovation.[2] However, the least innovative districts perceived their districts to be above average in innovation. Three variables--"board perception of community attitude toward innovation," "conflict over responsibility for determining educational policy," and "expenditure"--explained 77 per cent of the variation in the rate of district adoption of innovation. His research offered tentative support for the idea that the characteristics of superintendents are weakly related to innovation.

---

[1] Malcolm Richland, "A Study to Define an Operational Index of Innovation for School Administrators" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1968).

[2] Samuel G. Christie, "A Social System Analysis of Innovation in Sixteen School Districts" (unpublished paper from the Center for Study of Evaluation, University of California, undated).

Johnson and Marcum's paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, provided an appropriate conclusion.[1] They reported on a study of differences on four variables between 15 innovative and 15 non-innovative schools in five states. These variables were expenditure, age of staff, years in the schools, and number of professional staff. These were selected because, in the words of the report:

> Mort (1946) and Ross (1958) found expenditure to be a powerful factor in influencing change. Carlson (1956) and Richland (1965) and Rogers (1962) did not agree. . .Rogers (1965) said that innovators are generally young; however, Carnie (1966) and Lawrence (1967) found no association between age and the degree of innovativeness. . . Nicholas (1966). . .concluded that in the smaller open-climate schools the principal was able to initiate more varied activities and innovations than was possible in the larger closed-climate schools.

Johnson and Marcum found that highly innovative schools had "open climates" while less innovative schools had "closed climates"; and that highly innovative schools spent more per child, had younger staffs, and staffs that remained a fewer number of years, and that innovative schools were the larger schools.

---

[1] Homer M. Johnson and R. Laverne Marcum, "Organizational Climate and the Adoption of Educational Innovations." Paper presented at American Educational Research Association, February 5-8, 1969.

Summary

A review of literature related to the subject of adoption rate of innovations revealed that a tremendous amount has been written in these areas, but that the education field is in great need of further studies which will answer current critical questions as to why some innovations are adopted and others are not.

From a review of the literature on the development of Title III of ESEA, it seemed obvious that certain members of Congress and officials in the administrative branch of the Federal Government had defined the role of Title III rather clearly. Leaders such as Congressman Brademas, Commissioners Howe and Keppel, Secretaries Celebrezze and Gardner saw Title III's major role as that of diffusing new practices in education, often comparing the program, PACE, to that of an educational foundation.

It is also reasonably certain that other members of Congress had made no clear role differentiation for the program, often speaking of it in the same terms as Titles I and II of ESEA, and Titles III and V of the National Defense Education Act. From the perspective of present events, it is now clear that the advocates of general aid and block grants for aid to elementary and secondary education, Congresswoman Green and Congressman Quie, were developing strong allies among the chief state school officers and the education associations, and that they might be able to bring Title III into a block grant configuration by 1969. A key element to their strategy seemed to be the 1967 Amendments which made Title III a state plan program.

It also seemed clear that the nonpublic sector did not raise the issue of religious discrimination at critical points in the various debates.

Opponents of a federally-administered innovation program cited three major arguments against USOE direct involvement. These were: (1) threat of a federal school system competing with and weakening the present public school system, (2) illegal and unwise bypass of the state government, and (3) destruction of the "wall of separation" between church and state.

Those supporting a federal program against state control attempted to make a case for a national research and development program that would avoid needless duplication of innovations in each of the states. Generally, they tried to cast USOE in the role of a diffusion agent comparable to the successful Department of Agriculture Experimental Stations and Extension Service, or in the image of an educational foundation.

The review of the attempts to evaluate Title III revealed that all evaluations were relatively subjective, but optimistic that the program was serving its intended purposes effectively. The recommendations for improvement, though sometimes contradictory, were generally consistent in advocating

(1) higher levels of funding, (2) more local involvement with clear objectives, (3) better evaluation and dissemination provisions, and (4) more national and state priority goal-setting. However, with one exception, none of the evaluations were addressed to the essential question of project continuation following the termination of federal grants.

The literature on the change process is abundant, embracing several related fields. Researchers sometimes identified conflicting views as to which variables account for adoption of innovations. However, some agreement was developed along certain general lines. These included: (1) innovations must meet local needs and must be self-directed in order to survive; (2) cost of an innovation is a factor, but other advantages may offset it; (3) successful innovators understand the process of change and this understanding may offset the influence of other personal characteristics such as age and experience; (4) in order to accelerate the rate of change a national-state strategy is needed for the diffusion of educational innovations; (5) other disciplines have much to contribute to educational change in terms of understanding personal behavior, social systems, and power conflicts; and (6) innovations tend to deliver the benefits ascribed to them.

The problem of educational diffusion is quite well defined, the variables reasonably well identified, and several promising strategies or agendas for further research are well established. What seems to be needed now is a systematic approach and a greater financial commitment to testing these strategies.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES USED IN MAKING THE STUDY

The procedures followed in the conduct of the study were typical of those used in a descriptive research design. A question was identified bearing on an important education concern; the related literature was reviewed; a survey instrument was designed and field-tested; followups were made; and the collected data were summarized and analyzed for significant findings and implications for the solution of current educational concerns.

Selecting the Problem

The problem selected for study was one about which the writer had firsthand knowledge. As Chief of the Program Analysis and Dissemination Branch in USOE's Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, he had responsibility for administering operational evaluation studies and for reporting the results to appropriate administration staffs and Congress. The need for data on the particular problem of what was happening to Title III project activities after the USOE grants terminated was becoming, daily, more pressing as various staffs asked the question. One study of one-year and two-year terminated projects had reported a 16 per cent continuation rate, a rate which most evaluators of federal programs would define as failure of the program. Matthew Miles, for example, when asked what he would consider to be a reasonable rate for Title III projects continuation, responded that "Anything less than 30 per cent would be disastrous!"[1] When recently asked the same question, Robert Stake replied with the same 30 per cent rate in almost the same phraseology.[2] It seemed reasonable that the question could become the critical one as Congress moved toward consideration of the extension of ESEA in 1969.

Thus, with the continuation question as the dependent variable, the other questions regarding the effect of various independent variables fell into place. Studies by Mort, Rogers, Miles and others alluded to in the literature review all suggested the kind of data that might give indication of innovativeness in the survey population and the social system.

Selecting Dependent Variables

Selecting the questionnaire items that would have criticality was difficult. Obviously, for reasons of economy and adequate response, only a few of the variables likely to affect or predict adoption by local schools could be included. The literature seemed to indicate that at least three categories of variables should be considered: (1) characteristics of the adopter, (2) characteristics of the social system, and (3) characteristics of the innovation. A "few items" were selected from each of these categories.

---

[1] Consultation at A.E.R.A. Convention, Los Angeles, February 7, 1969.

[2] Consultation at Chicago O'Hare Airport, April 16, 1969.

For the adopter--in this case, the superintendent--age, sex, educational level, administrative experience, place of birth, cosmopolitanism, attitudes toward innovation, and his communication behavior were selected. As indicated in the review of literature, certain responses on the characteristics seemed indicative of innovative behavior.

For the social system--in this case, the community setting for the innovation--expenditure per child, enrollment, per cent attending college, average income, source of superintendent, degree of innovativeness, and degree of community involvement were chosen as characteristics. Again the research literature seemed to indicate associations with innovative behavior.

For the innovation itself--in this case, a Title III project--number and location of persons served, size of grant, degree of local commitment, per cent of inservice training, dissemination, evaluation, kind of activity, participation, visibility, compatibility, relative advantages, divisibility, and communicability were selected. Again, as reported in the literature review, there were studies indicating possible relationships.

Another category of related variables was added to provide a more comprehensive evaluation of Title III as a demonstration program. These included numbers of visitors to the demonstrations, the number of projects producing materials, and the number of replications of the program in other communities.

Analysis of the data was made in terms of frequency distributions means, per cents, chi square, t-tests, and contingency coefficients.

Designing the Questionnaire

The general format for the questionnaire was suggested by the design of Malcolm Richland's instrument used in Traveling Seminar and Conference for the Implementation of Educational Innovations.[1] The horizontal scale used is easily adapted to coding for the computer and the form is visually easy to follow. Perhaps an innovation by the writer was the inclusion of an abstract of the appropriate Title III project before the first question. The abstract combined two desirable purposes: (1) it gave some assurance that the superintendents were responding to the correct project, since they often have more than one project from several federal programs; and (2) it allowed the superintendent to correct the abstract, thus updating it for USOE records. The abstract also provided the writer with information for reviewing the responses to selected items concerning the validity of information by the respondent. For those who may wish to use this approach, the abstracts can be found in PACEsetters in Innovation.[2]

Responses to the question on continuation after termination of federal funding was divided into five categories: (1) "No, or not likely," (2) "Yes, on a smaller scale,"

---

[1] Malcolm Richland, Final Report: Traveling Seminar and Conference for Implementation of Educational Innovation: TM-2691 (Santa Monica: Systems Development Corp., 1965).

[2] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, PACEsetters in Innovation (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966, 1967, 1968).

(3) "Yes, on about the same scale," (4) "Yes, on a larger scale," and (5) "Yes, extended to all appropriate pupils in all schools."

In the development of this item for the survey instrument, it was assumed that each response would indicate the extent to which the project has reached complete adoption. It was intended that "on a smaller scale" response would mean a gradual phase-out of the project; that "about the same scale" would mean that the project was still in a "trial" phase; that "larger scale" would mean a degree of adoption; while "extended to all" would mean an adoption in the fullest sense of the word. However, telephone and face-to-face interviews with project personnel and superintendents later indicated that some of these categories were somewhat arbitrary, especially in regard to category (2) "smaller scale." It was found that smaller scale meant one or more of the following:

1. One or two services in the project were terminated when it was found that the activities were not needed, were poorly conducted, or that personnel was not available to continue them. In all cases, one or more activities in the original project were being continued, however.
2. The number of persons to be served was scaled down because the per-pupil cost was too high for all to benefit from local funds, or it was found that a select "hard core" of interested clientele was identified that would profit most by the program.

3. The cost of the project was scaled down because the equipment and training had been completed with federal funds.
4. The geographic area to be served was scaled down, following distance or communications problems.

Some reasons were a combination of the above. As one anonymous superintendent wrote:

> During the three years with federal money, we were able to experiment and find out which of several activities would best serve the needs of several groups of constituents. Now we're on solid ground and can justify a thoroughly tested and fiscally lean program to our Board of Education for continuation.

It was found, also, that the responses "on about the same scale," were more likely to mean that superintendents found the content and scope of the project appropriate to their needs and that they had recommended continuing it at that level. It was also realized that some of the projects started by serving "all appropriate pupils" so that expansion was impossible. It was concluded, therefore, that for purposes of analysis, it would be reasonable to dichotomize the responses on project continuation between "yes" and "no" responses, as appropriate.

Item number 13, which instructs the respondent to classify the project according to the major program emphasis, was carefully researched before its inclusion. The categories were developed by the writer after reading about 50 abstracts and recording the kind of services provided in the projects. Several versions of the listing of activities were developed before the final one emerged. The listing was tested by mailing it to 20 project directors and revised to be more inclusive as a result of the reactions.

It also was tested through the pretest of the questionnaire by ten superintendents. Early attempts on the pretest to force respondents to select one project activity over all others were unsuccessful. Interviews with respondents revealed that they did not want to "shortchange" the project. However, they admitted, in most cases, that the project could be said to have one _major_ emphasis. As an accommodation to the tendency of respondents to be all-inclusive, the ranking technique was employed and appeared to be successful.

Five items related to characteristics of the innovation were intended to seek the respondent's perception of the innovation according to characteristics developed by Miles. These included "visibility," "compatibility," "complexity," "divisibility," and "communicability."

As Woods pointed out:

> These descriptions of the characteristics are plausible, but the evidence showing that these characteristics have a noticeable effect on the spread of new ideas is far from conclusive _because adoption is an individual matter_.[1]

Miles would agree, since he maintained that it is the individual's _perception_ of the innovation that affects his behavior towards it. Therefore, these questions test only the superintendent's perception of the project traits.

The item seeking the number of innovations "tried in the district" was an attempt to develop an "innovativeness score" for the district. The assumption was made that the more often a district had tried a new idea, the more likely it would be that the district would be successful with a Title III project. The item was precoded on a scale from one to six with "six" being "more than 26 innovations." Responses were tabulated accordingly.

---

[1] Thomas E. Woods, _The Administration of Educational Innovation_ (Eugene: Bureau of Educational Research, University of Oregon, 1967), p. 30.

Item 37 was a self-test of the superintendent's "innovativeness." It was assumed that if he answered "1" that he would classify himself as an innovator, "2" as an early adopter, "3" as an early majority adopter, "4" late majority adopter and "5" as a laggard. These are Rogers' categories. It was assumed that there may be some significant relationships between "attitudes" and "continuations."

Most of the other items in the instrument are self-explanatory.

Determining the Population

Having determined that the dependent variable was adoption/nonadoption of completed three-year projects, the next step was to gain access to the official fiscal records on Title III projects. The Grants Management Branch of DPSC cooperated by supplying the funding and termination dates of all projects carrying fiscal year 1966 designation. It was discovered in reviewing this listing that several 1966 projects were not funded until late in the next fiscal year; thus, the projects could not have operated three years by the July 1, 1969 close-off date. It was decided to include in the survey all projects which met the following criteria:

1. It was funded as an operational project, as opposed to a planning grant. Operational projects were qualified to receive a USOE "tentative" commitment for sufficient funds to operate at least three years. Planning projects were usually one-year grants to plan or test the feasibility of a program preceding an application for an operational grant.
2. Before or by June 30, 1969 (or shortly thereafter) the project would have completed three years of operation.

A total of 330 projects met these criteria. Eighty-five ended before June 30, 1969; 138 ended on June 30, 1969. The remaining 107 ended shortly after June 30, 1969, and, in all cases, before the fall semester of school began.

Having determined the population, it was decided to survey one hundred per cent of the projects with the 39-item questionnaire shown in Appendix C.

Testing the Instrument

Several drafts of the instrument were developed and tested. Various items on the instrument were reviewed by Mr. Thomas Clemens, Chief, Research Utilization Branch, USOE's Bureau of Research; by Dr. Leon M. Lessinger, USOE Associate Commissioner for Elementary and Secondary Education (who had also recently left his position as Superintendent of Schools at San Mateo, California, where he was the administrator of a

Title III project); by Dr. David Iwamoto, Chief of the Program Analysis Section in DPSC; Dr. Glen Robinson, Assistant Executive Secretary for Research at N.E.A., and Dr. Lewis R. Tamblyn, Executive Secretary of the N.E.A.'s Department of Rural Education. Criticism was obtained by the writer's doctoral committee, Dr. Robert Baker, Dr. Stuart Westerlund, and Dr. Grover Angel of the School of Education, The George Washington University. Several project directors who visited the writer's office also read and commented on various drafts. A near-final version was sent to ten superintendents with Title III projects for their reactions. They were asked to complete the questionnaire and to make comments on an enclosed one-page, four-item questionnaire. Eight returned the questionnaire with helpful suggestions, many of which were incorporated into the final draft of the instrument. In the pre-test, the superintendents said that they found the questionnaire relatively easy to follow and that the data were readily available. One criticism which gave some concern was that data were more difficult to obtain for multiple-district projects, since the geographic areas served were much broader than for most single district projects. After debating whether to have separate questionnaires for each of the two categories, it was decided to send out the same form to all. An examination of returns showed that the superintendents left non-applicable items blank. The questionnaire was also coded multiple/single in order to test for any significant differences in responses.

Collecting the Data

The questionnaire was mailed to superintendents of 330 projects on February 5 and 6, 1969. The Department of Rural Education Association sponsored the survey and mailed the questionnaire with an enclosure of a return self-addressed and stamped envelope. The sponsorship of the Association gave the study greater visibility and may have helped produce an acceptable response.

One hundred forty questionnaires had been received when a postal card follow-up was sent to 190 non-respondents on March 5. A third follow-up was conducted by telephone of 103 non-respondents during the week of March 26 - April 2. The telephone interview was also used to collect data concerning the projects' continuation status. Superintendents were asked to indicate orally whether the project would continue following termination of the federal grant. A final tabulation of questionnaires from non-respondents showed that of the 60 that had been contacted by telephone, 36 or 60 per cent replied "yes" to continuing; 16, or 26.7 per cent responded, "no, not likely," and 8, or 13.3 per cent would not commit themselves. This information is summarized in Table 6, page 110.

On April 20, 1969, the survey was closed. Soon after, the 256 returned questionnaires were delived to the Measurement Research Center, Iowa City, Iowa, for further coding, key punching, and analysis. At that time, the 256 returns represented 77.5 per cent of the population of 330. An additional nine returns came in too late to be included in the analysis,

TABLE 6

NUMBERS AND PER CENTS RESPONSE TO TELEPHONE QUERY ON CONTINUATION OF PROJECTS OF NON-RESPONDENTS TO QUESTIONNAIRE

Response	Number	Per Cent
1. Yes, continue	36	60.0
2. No, not continue	16	26.7
3. Noncommittal	8	13.3
Total	60[a]	100.0

[a] An additional five non-respondent superintendents could not be reached by telephone.

bringing the total response to 265, or 80.3 per cent. A comparison of the non-respondents to respondents on the question of continuation showed significant differences in proportions. Non-respondents gave "no" answers to "continuation" in 24.6 per cent of the interviews while questionnaire respondents gave "no" answers on 7.9 per cent of the questionnaires. Table 7, page 111, shows these differences and shows the total "no" responses at 11.2 per cent.

Analysis Plan for Data

As mentioned previously, it was decided to compute number and per cent of responses on the five possible responses to question one, "continuation." It then would be possible to determine whether there were indications that those responding variously among the four "yes" options had different personnel, school systems, or innovative traits. If an examination of

TABLE 7

COMPARISON OF TELEPHONE INTERVIEW AND QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDENTS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Responses	Combined		Interview		Questionnaire	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
No, not likely	37	11.2	16	24.6	21	7.9
Yes, continuing	279	84.5	36	55.4	243	91.7
No response[1]	14	4.3	13	20.0	1	0.4
Totals	330	100.0	65	100.0	265	100.0

[1] "non-response" includes eight who gave evasive answers by telephone interview, five who could not be reached by telephone, and one who did not circle an answer in the questionnaire.

the data revealed no significant differences among the responses, the four "yes" responses could be collapsed into one "yes" for comparison with the "no" responses on all other appropriate variables.

The analysis plan for the data also included coding each questionnaire as to "less innovative/most innovative," and "rural/urban." Thirty-three projects in the population had been judged "most innovative" by those responsible for reviewing, evaluating, and recommending approval or non-approval of all applications for projects under Title III. The judges were USOE personnel who had a national perspective on what could be considered innovative. In many cases, they had visited the project site. They had also been required to defend their choices before a panel of their peers and their supervisors. These projects were the same projects included in the evaluation report by Benson and Guthrie reviewed earlier in the literature review section.[1] Site evaluation by the members of Benson and Guthrie study team seemed to confirm the more innovative quality of these proposals.

It was also assumed that significant differences would be evident between projects which served urban and those which served rural areas. Rural and urban were determined from the responses to question eight, which asked respondents to indicate number of persons served in each of eight U.S. Bureau of the Census classifications as follows:

1. Large city (over 500,000)
2. Suburb of large city above
3. Rural near a large city above
4. Middle-sized city (50,000 - 500,000)
5. Suburb of a middle-sized city above
6. Rural area near middle-sized city above
7. Small city or town (less than 50,000)
8. Rural area, not near large or middle-sized city

For purposes of analysis, categories 1, 2, 4, and 5 were collapsed into "urban" and categories 3, 6, 7, and 8 became "rural." Where respondents checked items in both categories, an "urban-rural" combination category was established.

Special tabulations were also planned on item 4, number of persons visiting the project from other communities, with a comparison to be made between the mean of adopted and non-adopted projects. The same analysis was proposed for item 5, number of schools that had adopted similar programs as a result of visits to the Title III project.

---

[1] Supra., p. 75.

Comparisons were also planned among adopted and non-adopted projects regarding source of funding for projects.

It was planned to compute the number and per cent of persons served by rural and urban, and by four geographic regions. Also contemplated was a state listing of total projects with number and per cent of adoptions and non-adoptions.

The possibilities for analyses of these data are numerous and, with computer availability, it was tempting to conduct a great many other analyses. Those selected were thought to have the most meaningful application of current developments.

The analysis of the data including extent of continuation of the projects and the characteristics of projects, school systems, and the superintendents, will be presented in Chapter IV. A summary, conclusions, and recommendations will be presented in Chapter V. Data on the Less and Most Innovative Projects will be found in tables in Appendix F. Appendix D contains abstracts of the "most innovative" projects. Data on Rural, Urban, and Combined Projects will be found in tables contained in Appendix E.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter will present the analysis of the data from the survey in four sections according to the analysis plan. The first section will present data regarding the extent of continuations of the projects, sources of funding for continuation, extent of the project's effectiveness as a demonstration, possible associations between continuation and geographic location, scope of the project and kinds of persons served. The second section will take up the possible associations between characteristics of the innovation and extent of continuation. Section three will discuss the characteristics of the school and community as they may be associated with continuation and adoption of the programs by those communities. In section four, the characteristics of the superintendents will be described as they may be associated with the adoption of the innovation.

The analyses that follow were based on a return of 256 questionnaires representing 77.6 per cent of the survey population. Nine additional questionnaires were returned too late to be included in the analyses. When late returns were included, the return rate was 80.3 per cent. Sixty-five questionnaires were not returned.[1] Table 8 has this analysis.

TABLE 8

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRES RETURNED BY TITLE III SUPERINTENDENTS

Status of Questionnaires	Number	Per Cent
Computer analysis	256	77.6
Late	9	2.7
Unreturned	65	19.7
Totals	330	100.0

Extent of Continuation

According to the superintendents, 235 of the 256 Title III projects in the questionnaire response would be continuing or had already been continued following termination of the Title III federal grant. This represents a 91.8 per cent continuation or adoption rate for Title III projects in the survey. Twenty-one, or 8.2 per cent, had terminated or were likely to terminate.

The positive responses break down into four categories as follows: one hundred seven, or 41.8 per cent were continuing on a smaller scale; 81 or 31.6 per cent were continuing on the same scale; 27, or 10.6 per cent were continuing on a larger scale; and 19, or 7.4 per cent were extended to all appropriate pupils in all appropriate schools in the project area. One respondent did not check the item. Table 9 shows this analysis.

---

[1] *Supra*., p. 109.

TABLE 9

NUMBERS AND PER CENTS OF CONTINUATION OF TITLE III PROJECTS FOLLOWING TERMINATION OF FEDERAL GRANTS

Responses	Number	Per Cent
No, or not likely	21	8.2
Yes, smaller scale	107	41.8
Yes, same scale	81	31.6
Yes, larger scale	27	10.6
Yes, extended to all	19	7.4
No response on item	1	0.4
Totals	256	100.0

Continuations by States

Five states, the District of Columbia, Guam, P[illegible]erto Rico, and the Virgin Islands are not included in the survey results. With the exception of Tennessee, with one project, these states or territories did not have projects operative in fiscal year 1966 and therefore did not meet the criteria for the study. The following 13 states had continuation rates below the national continuation rate of 92 per cent: Alabama, California, Indiana, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. Three states--Indiana, West Virginia, and Wisconsin--were below 75 per cent. West Virginia's rate was 50 per cent. Thirty-one states had 100 per cent of their projects continuing. Table 10 shows this analysis.

TABLE 10

CONTINUATION OF TITLE III PROJECTS BY STATE, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

States	Total Number Responding	Responses			
		No		Yes	
		Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Alabama	6	1	16.7	5	83.3
Alaska	1	0	0.0	1	100.0
Arizona	3	0	0.0	3	100.0
Arkansas	0	0	0.0	0	0.0
California	23	3	13.0	20	87.0
Colorado	3	0	0.0	3	100.0
Connecticut	1	0	0.0	1	100.0
Delaware	3	0	0.0	3	100.0
District of Columbia	0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Florida	4	0	0.0	4	100.0
Georgia	11	0	0.0	11	100.0
Guam	0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Hawaii	2	0	0.0	2	100.0
Idaho	3	0	0.0	3	100.0
Illinois	11	1	9.1	10	91.9
Indiana	8	2	25.0	6	75.0
Iowa	6	0	0.0	6	100.0
Kansas	6	0	0.0	6	100.0
Kentucky	5	1	20.0	4	80.0
Louisiana	5	0	0.0	5	100.0
Maine	2	0	0.0	2	100.0
Maryland	2	0	0.0	2	100.0
Massachusetts	5	1	20.0	4	80.0
Michigan	10	2	20.0	8	80.0
Minnesota	7	0	0.0	7	100.0
Mississippi	2	0	0.0	2	100.0
Missouri	5	1	20.0	4	80.0
Montana	7	1	14.3	6	85.7
Nebraska	5	0	0.0	5	100.0
Nevada	0	0	0.0	0	0.0
New Hampshire	2	0	0.0	2	100.0
New Jersey	15	1	6.7	14	93.3
New Mexico	5	1	20.0	4	80.0
New York	17	0	0.0	17	100.0
North Carolina	3	0	0.0	3	100.0
North Dakota	2	0	0.0	2	100.0
Ohio	10	0	0.0	10	100.0
Oklahoma	2	0	0.0	2	100.0
Oregon	6	1	16.7	5	83.3

TABLE 10 -- Continued

States	Total Number Responding	No		Yes	
		Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Pennsylvania	10	2	20.0	8	80.0
Puerto Rico	0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Rhode Island	3	0	0.0	3	100.0
South Carolina	4	0	0.0	4	100.0
South Dakota	0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Tennessee	0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Texas	9	0	0.0	9	100.0
Utah	4	0	0.0	4	100.0
Vermont	1	0	0.0	1	100.0
Virgin Islands	0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Virginia	2	0	0.0	2	100.0
Washington	3	0	0.0	3	100.0
West Virginia	4	2	50.0	2	50.0
Wisconsin	4	1	25.0	3	75.0
Wyoming	3	0	0.0	3	100.0
Totals	255	21	8.2	234	91.8

Responses

Geographical Regions

The 50 states were grouped into four geographical regions for analysis of any differences among them. A North region was formed by combining regions 1 and 2 of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; South by combining regions 3 and 4; Middle by regions 5, 6, and 7; and West by 8 and 9. The states included in this alignment are as follows:

North: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

South: Alabama, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Middle: Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wisconsin.

West: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

The analysis by region revealed that of the 253 responses on the continuation item, 60 or 23.7 per cent were from the North; 42 or 16.1 per cent from the South; 92, or 36.3 per cent, Middle; and 59 or 23.4 per cent, West. Also, 56 or 24.1 per cent of the projects continuing were in the North; 38 or 16.1 per cent were in the South; 84 or 36.2 per cent were in the Middle; 54 or 23.6 per cent were in the West. The North had the smallest per cent of their projects discontinued, 6.7 per cent; and the South had the largest, 9.5 per cent.

The Middle states region had the highest percentage, 29 per cent, of their projects continued on a "smaller scale," and the smallest percentage of the projects continued on a "larger" and "extended to all," scale, 7.6 and 3.3 respectively.

The chi square score revealed no significant association between the variable of region and extent of continuation at the .05 level.

The numbers and per cents of each of 5 responses by the four regions are summarized in Table 11, page 121.

Multiple-Districts Versus Single Districts

Projects that served one school district were compared with projects serving two or more school districts as to extent of continuation. The number of discontinuations were about the same, 11 for single district projects and 10 for multiple-distric projects. Responses on the four "yes" continuation items also were relatively the same, though single district projects had a smaller per cent of the responses "continued on a larger scale," 8.5 per cent as compared to 13.5 per cent for multiple-district projects. At the .05 level, the chi square score showed no significant association between continuation and number of districts served by the project. Table 12, pages 122 and 123, shows numbers and per cents of responses on each of the five possible answers.

Most Innovative Versus Less Innovative

The projects rated "most innovative" by Title III management personnel were compared with all other projects in the population on the five possible responses to the continuation item.

According to the superintendents' responses, 100 per cent of the "most innovative" projects were continued. However, 15 or 45.5 per cent of the 33 "most innovative" projects were in the "smaller scale" category and only 3.0 per cent were in the extended to "all possible pupils" category, as compared to 41.1

TABLE 11

CONTINUATION OF TITLE III PROJECTS BY FOUR GEOGRAPHICAL REGIONS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Geographical Regions	Total Responses		Total	Extent of Continuation									
				No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
North[1]	60	23.7	100.0	4	6.7	21	35.0	21	35.0	6	10.0	8	13.3
South[2]	42	16.6	100.0	4	9.5	14	33.3	12	28.6	7	16.7	5	11.9
Middle[3]	92	36.4	100.0	8	8.7	45	48.9	29	31.5	7	7.6	3	3.3
West[4]	59	23.3	100.0	5	8.5	25	42.4	19	32.2	7	11.8	3	5.1
Totals	253	100.0		21		105		81		27		19	

[1] Conn., Del., Me., Mass., N.H., N.J., Pa., R.I., Vt.

[2] Ala., D.C., Fla., Ga., Ky., La., Md., Miss., N.C., S.C., Tenn., Va., W. Va.

[3] Ark., Ill., Ind., Iowa, Kans., Mich., Minn., Mo., Neb., N.D., Ohio, S.D., Wisc.

[4] Alaska, Ariz., Calif., Colo., Hawaii, Idaho, Mont., Nev., N.M., Okla., Ore., Utah, Wash., Wyo.

Chi Square $= 11.92$ $p < .50$ $C = 0.21$

TABLE 12

CONTINUATION OF TITLE III PROJECTS BY SINGLE DISTRICT AND MULTIPLE-DISTRICT CLASSIFICATIONS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Scope of The Project	Responses									
	No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Single district	11	52.4	61	58.1	49	60.5	12	44.4	9	47.4
Multiple district	10	47.6	44	41.9	32	39.5	15	55.6	10	52.6
Totals	21	100.0	105	100.0	81	100.0	27	100.0	19	100.0

TABLE 12 -- Continued

Scope of The Project	Responses											
	Total		No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Single district	142	100.0	11	7.7	61	43.0	49	34.5	12	8.5	9	6.3
Multiple district	111	100.0	10	9.0	44	39.7	32	28.8	15	13.5	10	9.0
Totals	153		21		105		81		27		19	

Chi Square $= 2.84$ $p < .70$ $C = 0.105$

per cent and 8.2 per cent respectively for these two items for the less innovative projects. Twenty-one per cent of the "most innovative" projects were to be continued on a larger scale, however as compared to 9.1 per cent of the "less innovative" projects. Though the association between projects selected as "most innovative" and continuation was not quite significant at the .05 level, it seemed that USOE selected innovative projects were more likely to be continued than non-selected, projects. Table 13 shows this analysis.

TABLE 13

CONTINUATION OF TITLE III PROJECTS, BY MOST INNOVATIVE, AND LESS INNOVATIVE CATEGORIES, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

	Selected As Innovative By USOE			
Responses	Selected		Not Selected	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
No, not likely	0	0.0	21	9.6
Yes, smaller scale	15	45.5	92	41.1
Yes, same scale	10	30.3	70	32.0
Yes, larger scale	7	21.2	20	9.1
Yes, all appropriate pupils	1	3.0	18	8.2
Totals	33	100.0	222	100.0

Chi Square $=$ 8.25 $p < .10$ C $= .17$

Rural Versus Urban

Looking at possible differences among responses based on location of the persons served, it was found that projects serving urban areas only, represented 23.7 per cent of the responses, or 60 projects, while 46.8 per cent, or 117 projects, served rural areas. About 26.7 per cent, or 73 projects, served both rural and urban areas.

Rural projects had the largest number and proportions of discontinuation responses, 12, or 60.0 per cent, as compared to 2, or 10.0 per cent, for urban, and 6, or 30.0 per cent for combined. The chi square score indicated that the association between location of population served and continuation of the project was significant at the .05 level. Table 14, page 126, has this analysis.

Source of Funds

Superintendents with projects which were continued were asked the funding source for the continuation. Of seven options, "local educational agency" support was checked 191 times representing 47.5 per cent of the responses. "Fees from pupils," was checked 45, or 11.2 per cent, of the times; "business and industry," was checked 16, or 4.0 per cent, of the times; "state education agencies," was checked 62, or 15.4 per cent; "foundations," 16, or 4.0 per cent; "a new federal grant," 37, or 9.2 per cent; and "other," 35, or 8.7 per cent. Altogether, 402 sources were checked, indicating that the average project was being continued using approximately 1.5 sources for funding. No significant differences in sources of funding were noted among the four categories of continuation responses. Projects continued on a smaller scale or on the same scale seemed to rely

TABLE 14

CONTINUATION OF TITLE III PROJECTS BY RURAL, URBAN, COMBINED CLASSIFICATIONS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Responses	Rural		Urban		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
No, Not Likely	12	10.3	2	3.3	6	8.2
Yes, Smaller	59	50.4	20	33.3	26	35.6
Yes, Same	32	27.4	27	45.0	21	28.8
Yes, Larger	7	6.0	8	13.3	11	15.1
Yes, All	7	6.0	3	5.0	9	12.3
Total (250)	117	100.0	60	100.0	73	100.0
Mean Per Cents	46.8		23.7		26.7	

Responses	Totals		Rural		Urban		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
No, Not Likely	20	100.0	12	60.0	2	10.0	6	30.0
Yes, Smaller	105	100.0	59	56.2	20	19.0	26	24.8
Yes, Same	80	100.0	32	40.0	27	33.7	21	26.2
Yes, Larger	26	100.0	7	26.9	8	30.8	11	42.3
Yes, All	19	100.0	7	36.8	3	15.8	9	47.4

Chi Square $= 17.64$ $p < .05$ $C = 0.25$

more heavily on support from fees from pupils, foundations, and business and industry. There were no significant differences between rural and urban projects and between less and most innovative projects on this variable. Table 15, pages 128 and 129, Table 49, page 263, and Table 78, page 293, give these breakdowns.

Superintendent's Recommendation

Superintendents were asked to indicate if they had made the recommendation to the board of education to either continue or discontinue the project. Two hundred twenty-one or 86.3 per cent replied "yes," 23 replied "no." An examination of the "yes" and "no" responses on the recommendation revealed that of the 221 times that superintendents made a recommendation, 210 or 95.1 per cent were for projects that were continued and 11 or 4.9 per cent were projects that were discontinued. Of the 23 times that the superintendent replied that they did not make the final recommendation, 14 projects or 60.8 per cent were continued and 9 projects or 39.2 per cent were discontinued. The chi square score showed a statistically significant association between continuation and the superintendent's recommendation to the board at the .001 level. There were no significant differences between urban and rural projects and between less and most innovative projects. Table 16, page 130, Table 50 page 264, and Table 79, page 294, show these analyses.

Extent of Instructional Materials Produced

Superintendents were asked if the project had produced

TABLE 15

SOURCES OF FUNDING BY CONTINUATION OF TITLE III PROJECTS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Financial Source	Total Responses		Total Per Cent	Extent of Continuation									
				No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent		Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Local education agency	191	47.5	100.0	2	1.0	88	46.1	67	35.1	20	10.5	14	7.3
Fees from pupils	45	11.2	100.0	1	2.2	22	48.9	15	33.3	4	8.9	3	6.7
Business/industry	16	4.0	100.0	0	0.0	6	37.5	6	37.5	2	12.5	2	12.5
State education agency	62	15.4	100.0	0	0.0	21	33.9	23	37.1	11	17.7	7	11.3

TABLE 15 -- Continued

Financial Source	Total Responses			Extent of Continuation									
				No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Total Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Foundations	16	4.0	100.0	0	0.0	7	43.8	7	43.8	2	12.5	0	0.0
A new federal grant	37	9.2	100.0	1	2.7	16	43.2	11	29.7	7	18.9	2	5.4
Other	35	8.7	100.0	2	5.7	14	40.0	13	37.1	4	11.4	2	5.7
Totals	402[a]	100.0		6		174		142		50		30	

[a] Total exceeds survey population since respondents were asked to check all appropriate sources.

Chi Square $=$ 12.85 $\quad p < .98 \quad C = 0.18$

TABLE 16

SUPERINTENDENTS RECOMMENDING CONTINUATION AND DISCONTINUATION, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Project Status	Superintendent Made A Recommendation			
	Yes		No	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Continued	210	95.1	14	60.8
Discontinued	11	4.9	9	39.2
Totals	221	100.0	23	100.0

Chi Square $= 33.71$ $p < .001$ $C = 0.34$

instructional materials. One hundred ninety-five or about 77 per cent replied "yes," and 59 or 23 per cent replied "no." About 6.7 per cent of 195 projects producing materials were in discontinued projects. About 13.6 per cent of the projects not producing materials were discontinued, twice as high as those producing materials. The association between producing materials and continuation was not quite significant at the .05 level. Table 17, page 131, has this analysis. No significant differences were noted between rural and urban projects on this variable. Projects designated as most innovative by USOE produced a higher percentage of "yes" responses than the non-selected categories, though this association was not significant at the .05 level. Table 51, page 264, and Table 80, page 295, have these analyses.

TABLE 17

CONTINUATION OF THE PROJECTS BY AMOUNTS OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS PRODUCED, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Produced Materials	Total Number of Projects	Extent of Continuation									
		No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
		Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Yes	195	13	6.7	82	42.0	59	30.3	25	12.8	16	8.2
No	59	8	13.5	25	42.4	21	35.6	2	3.4	3	5.1
Totals	254	21		107		80		27		19	

Chi Square $= 7.39$ $p < .20$ $C = 0.16$

Extent of Demonstration

Two questions were asked relative to the demonstration aspects of the projects: (1) how many persons from outside the project community visited the project and (2) how many schools introduced similar programs as a result of the visits?

Superintendents reported a total of 256,191 visitors during the three-year period of their projects. The mean was 1,108. When categorized as to continuation and discontinuation, the number of persons visiting discontinued projects was 22,847 with a mean of 1,138. Continued projects were visited by 233,334 with a mean of 1,105. Though discontinued projects received more visitors per project, there was no significant differences between extent of continuation and the number of visitors. Table 18 has this analysis.

TABLE 18

NUMBERS, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF OUTSIDE VISITORS TO TITLE III PROJECTS DURING THREE YEARS

Item	Continuation of Project		
	Totals	Continued	Discontinued
Number of visitors	256,181	233,334	22,847
Means	1,108	1,105	1,138
Standard deviations	-	2,163	2,888
Number of projects reporting	232	211	21

$t = 0.06$

On the second question, number of similar programs, 120 superintendents reported 2,460 programs introduced in other school districts as a result of a visit to their projects. One hundred thirty-six superintendents left the item blank, indicating that they did not know. The mean number of new programs started as a result of each Title III project was 20.4. The mean of continued projects was 20.7 and of discontinued projects was 16.0. Table 19 shows the comparisons.

TABLE 19

NUMBERS, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF SIMILAR PROGRAMS STARTED AS A RESULT OF VISITS TO PROJECTS DURING THREE YEARS

Item	Continuation of Project		
	Totals	Continued	Discontinued
Number of new programs	2,460	2,334	126
Means	20.4	20.7	16.0
Standard deviations	-	57.7	30.7
Number of projects reporting	120	112	8

$t = 0.23$

Influence of Other Funds

During the three years the total amount of funds from all sources for the projects in this study was $133,810,000. This breaks down as $128,837,000 for continued projects and $4,973,000 for discontinued projects.

The amount of funds from Title III sources for all projects was $93,627,000 or 70.0 per cent, with $88,800,000 of this for continued projects and $4,827,000 for discontinued projects. The amount of funds from "other sources" (federal, state, and foundations) was $12,214,000 or 9.1 per cent, with $12,141,000 for continued and $73,000 for discontinued projects. The local educational agencies contributed a total of $27,969,000, or 20.9 per cent, with $27,896,000 for continued projects and $73,000 for discontinued projects. Continued projects had the largest percentage of local commitment, 21.7 per cent as compared with 1.4 per cent for discontinued projects.

There seems to be an association between the amount of local commitment of funds to a project and its continuation by school districts following the termination of the federal grants. This analysis is shown in Table 20, page 135.

Characteristics of Projects

One of the assumptions made for this study was that the characteristics of the innovation in the Title III projects would influence whether a project would be continued and thus be adopted by the school system. This section analyzes the responses on 14 questionnaire items representing selected characteristics of the projects.

Size of Population Served

The total number of persons served by all projects during their three years of operation was 17,106,547, or about 5,882,000

TABLE 20

DOLLAR AMOUNTS AND PER CENTS OF THREE-YEAR PROJECT FUNDS FROM TITLE III LOCAL, AND OTHER SOURCES, CONTINUED VERSUS DISCONTINUED PROJECTS

Funding Sources	Totals of Columns (4) Thru (7)		Continued		Discontinued	
	Amount	Per Cent	Amount	Per Cent	Amount	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Title III	93,627,000	70.0	88,800,000	68.9	4,827,000	97.2
Local districts	27,969,000	20.9	27,896,000	21.7	73,000	1.4
Other (federal, state foundations)	12,214,000	9.1	12,141,000	9.4	73,000	1.4
Totals	$133,810,000	100.0	$128,837,000	100.0	$4,973,000	100.0

annually. This item on the questionnaire was intended to solicit data as to how many pupils or persons were actually participated in project activities and therefore directly benefited from project activities. However, the size of the population in the responses, raises some question as to whether superintendents may have reported all persons indirectly benefiting as well. Superintendents may have reasoned that Title III projects were intended to serve as demonstrations for all persons in their project area. Therefore population data should be used for comparison among the various categories of continuation only.

Only 2.7 per cent of the persons served were in discontinued projects. About 28.4 per cent were in "continued on a smaller scale" category; 35.8 per cent in "same scale" projects; 23.6 per cent in "larger scale" and 9.8 per cent in "to all appropriate" category. The mean numbers of persons served were as follows: "no," 22,136; "smaller," 45,422; "same," 74,981; "larger," 149,627; "all," 87,795. The mean for the entire population served by continued projects was 67,084. Discontinued projects were one third the size of the average project. Therefore the number of persons served would seem to be a factor in the decision to continue or not to continue projects. Table 21, page 137, shows this analysis.

Budgets of Projects

Superintendents reported the three-year cost of projects from all sources. The mean for continued projects was $553,000 as compared to $230,000 for discontinued projects. The size of

TABLE 21

PERSONS SERVED BY PROJECTS, NUMBER AND PER CENTS BY EXTENT OF CONTINUATION

Extent of Continuation	Total	Persons Served		
		Number	Means	Per Cent
No, not likely	21	464,785	22,136	2.7
Yes, smaller	107	4,860,193	45,422	28.4
Yes, same	81	6,073,495	74,981	35.5
Yes, larger	27	4,039,975	149,627	23.6
Yes, all	19	1,668,099	87,795	9.8
Totals	255	17,106,547	67,084	100.0

budget would seem to be a factor in the continuation of the project. Table 22 has this analysis.

TABLE 22

COMPARISON OF THE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF DOLLAR AMOUNTS OF CONTINUED VERSUS DISCONTINUED PROJECTS

Item	Continued	Discontinued
Means	$553,000	$230,000
Standard deviation	$172,000	$175,000

Total Mean $525,000 $t = 1.405$

The mean per cent of the budgets devoted to training, orienting, or otherwise preparing personnel to perform the activities of the project was 21.9 per cent. Thirty-four per cent indicated that 15 per cent and over of the budget was devoted to this activity; 20 per cent devoted 2 per cent or less.

The per cent devoted to training was associated negatively with the continuation of the project. Forty per cent of the discontinued projects indicated that 15 per cent or more in their budget was for training. The association was significant at the .001 level. The mean per cents were 22.4 for "discontinued" and 18.2 for "continued" projects. Table 23, page 139, has this analysis.

Differences were noted among the percentages devoted to training of rural, urban, and mixed categories of projects with mean per cents at 18.99, 17.36 and 16.56 respectively. Rural had the largest per cent of projects with 2 per cent or less of their budgets for training. The chi square was significant at the .001 level. Table 52, page 265, has this analysis.

Fifteen of the 33, or 45.4 per cent, of the projects designated as most innovative by USOE had training budgets of 15 per cent and over which is higher than the overall of 29.8 per cent, and higher than the less innovative at 27.0 per cent. This was significant at the .001 level. The mean for most innovative projects was 23.12 per cent and for the less innovative projects, 17.28 per cent, considerably lower. This analysis is found in Table 81, page 296.

The per cent of the budget devoted to dissemination

TABLE 23

NUMBERS, PER CENTS, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF PROJECTS WITH VARIOUS PERCENTAGES OF BUDGETS DEVOTED TO TRAINING, CONTINUED VERSUS DISCONTINUED PROJECTS

Per Cent of Budget in Ranges	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
0	34	13.3	6	28.6	16	15.0	10	12.3	1	3.7	1	5.3
1 - 2	45	17.6	3	14.2	18	16.8	17	21.0	3	11.1	4	21.0
3 - 4	14	5.5	1	4.8	4	3.7	7	8.6	1	3.7	1	5.3
5 - 6	39	15.3	2	9.5	19	17.8	12	14.8	5	18.5	1	5.3
7 - 8	7	2.7	0	0.0	3	2.8	2	2.5	0	0.0	2	10.5
9 - 10	32	12.6	2	9.5	13	12.1	11	13.6	2	7.4	4	21.0
11 - 12	4	1.6	1	4.8	1	1.0	1	1.2	1	3.7	0	0.0
13 - 14	4	1.6	0	0.0	3	2.8	0	0.0	1	3.7	0	0.0
15 & over	76	29.8	6	28.6	30	28.0	21	26.0	13	48.2	6	31.6
Totals	255	100.0	21	100.0	107	100.0	81	100.0	27	100.0	19	100.0

Chi Square $=$ 130.04 $p < .001$ $C = 0.60$ $t = 0.47$

Item	Continued Projects	Discontinued Projects
Means	18.2 per cent	22.4 per cent
Standard Deviations	26.3 per cent	21.5 per cent

Total Mean -- 21.9 per cent

activities such as newsletters, television, films, community meetings, brochures, and tours averaged 7.42 per cent. One hundred seventeen, or 45.8 per cent, devoted 2 per cent or less to these activities; 26, or 10.2 per cent, devoted 15 per cent or more. Projects extended to all pupils had the largest per cent, 44.4, in the low 0 - 2 per cent range. The mean of continued projects was 7.31 per cent while the mean of discontinued projects was 8.65 per cent. Variations were significant at the .001 level of significance. Table 24, page 141, shows these comparisons.

Rural and urban projects had approximately the same percentages in all budget ranges. The combined category had the most projects in a range of 9.0 per cent and above, and the least in the 0 - 2 per cent range. This association was significant at the .001 level. Table 53, page 266, has this analysis.

The most innovative projects had a smaller per cent of projects in the lower range (0 - 2 per cent) and a smaller per cent in the higher range as compared to the less innovative projects. The mean of innovative projects was 5.57 as compared to 7.0 for less innovative. Table 82, page 297, has this analysis.

The per cent of the budgets devoted to evaluation activities averaged 7.43 per cent. The mean per cent for continued projects was 6.99 and for discontinued projects, 9.31. One hundred twenty, or 47.0 per cent, of the 255 projects reporting indicated that their evaluation budgets were 0 - 2

TABLE 24

NUMBERS, PER CENT, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF PROJECTS WITH VARIOUS PERCENTAGES OF BUDGETS DEVOTED TO DISSEMINATION, CONTINUED VERSUS DISCONTINUED PROJECTS

Per Cent of Budget in Ranges	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
0	34	13.3	2	9.5	15	14.0	12	14.8	4	14.8	1	5.3
1 - 2	83	32.5	5	23.8	34	31.8	28	34.6	8	29.7	8	42.1
3 - 4	29	11.4	2	9.5	9	8.4	9	11.1	5	18.5	4	21.0
5 - 6	39	15.3	5	23.8	16	15.0	12	14.8	4	14.8	2	10.5
7 - 8	3	1.2	0	0.0	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	10.5
9 - 10	36	14.1	3	14.3	23	21.5	7	8.6	2	7.4	1	5.3
11 - 12	4	1.6	0	0.0	2	1.9	2	2.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
13 - 14	1	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
15 & over	26	10.2	4	19.1	6	5.6	11	13.6	4	14.8	1	5.3
Totals	255	100.0	21	100.0	107	100.0	81	100.0	27	100.0	19	100.0

Chi Square $= 99.79$ $p < .001$ $C = 0.558$ $t = 0.48$

Item	Continued Projects	Discontinued Projects
Means	7.31 per cent	8.65 per cent
Standard Deviations	11.8 per cent	11.14 per cent

Total Mean -- 7.42 per cent

per cent of the project budget. Fifteen, or 5.9 per cent, had 15 per cent or over. Differences among the various categories of continuation were significant at the .001 level. Continued projects had a mean of 5.41 per cent and discontinued projects had a mean of 9.31, significantly higher.

Projects not continuing had the highest per cent of projects in the "15 per cent or more" range and the least in the "0 - 2 per cent" range. Projects "extended to all" had the highest per cent in the 0 - 2 per cent range. Table 25, page 143, has this analysis.

The combined category of urban and rural had a significantly smaller per cent, 30.1, in the "2 per cent or less" range as compared to 51.6 per cent and 54.2 per cent for urban and rural respectively. The combined category seemed to be a more evenly distributed among the various ranges and also had the highest mean, 7.18 per cent. Rural projects had the smallest per cent for evaluation. Associations were significant at the .001 level. Table 54, page 267, has this analysis.

Differences between most innovative and less innovative projects on the per cent devoted to evaluation activities were not significant at the .05 level though less innovative had the largest per cent with higher budgets. Table 83, page 298, has this analysis.

Major Program Emphasis

Superintendents were asked to classify their project according to major program emphasis by ranking in order of effort. The analysis showed that 18 projects, or 6.8 per cent,

TABLE 25

NUMBERS, PER CENTS, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF PROJECTS WITH VARIOUS PERCENTAGES OF BUDGETS DEVOTED TO EVALUATION, CONTINUED VERSUS DISCONTINUED PROJECTS

Per Cent of Budget in Ranges	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)*		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
0	27	10.6	2	9.5	8	7.5	11	13.6	5	18.5	1	5.3
1 - 2	93	36.4	7	33.3	41	38.3	28	34.5	7	25.9	9	47.3
3 - 4	27	10.6	2	9.5	9	8.4	15	18.5	0	0.0	1	5.3
5 - 6	53	20.8	6	28.6	21	19.6	14	17.3	10	37.1	3	15.8
7 - 8	7	2.7	0	0.0	5	4.7	2	2.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
9 - 10	28	11.0	1	4.8	15	14.0	8	9.9	2	7.4	2	10.5
11 - 12	3	1.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.2	1	3.7	1	5.3
13 - 14	2	0.8	0	0.0	2	1.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
15 & over	15	5.9	3	14.3	6	5.6	2	2.5	2	7.4	2	10.5
Totals	255	100.0	21	100.0	107	100.0	81	100.0	27	100.0	19	100.0

*Detail may not add to total since one project was checked for percentage but not for continuation.

Chi Square $=$ 103.09 $\quad p < .001 \quad C = 0.558 \quad t = 1.89$

Item	Continued Projects	Discontinued Projects
Means	5.41 per cent	9.31 per cent
Standard Deviations	6.99 per cent	19.30 per cent

Total Mean -- 7.43 per cent

developed a new course offering in the regular curriculum, 38 projects, or 14.3 per cent, made new use of or retrained teachers or other school-related personnel; 18 or 6.8 per cent, undertook a major reorganization of the school and/or curriculum; 99, or 37.5 offered supplementary and/or enrichment courses or activities; 7 or 2.6 per cent, attempted new ways to achieve community understandings, participation, or racial or social integration; 39, or 14.7 per cent, made new uses of technology to reach more persons more effectively; 20, or 7.5 per cent offered new guidance, counseling, testing, or remedial services; 13, or 4.9 per cent, undertook planning, evaluation and dissemination services; and 13, or 4.9 per cent, provided special education for the handicapped.

When analyzed as to continuation the data revealed that 11 or 52.3 per cent of the discontinued projects were those with their major emphasis in supplementary services and enrichment activities. Of these projects being extended to all appropriate pupils, 8 of the 18 or 44.4 per cent were in the use of new technology. Also of projects being continued at a smaller scale, 50 of 114, or 43.9 per cent, were supplementary services. Of those being continued at about the same level, 30 of 83, or 36.1 per cent were supplementary services. Projects with planning, evaluation, and dissemination as a major emphasis had the lowest continuation rate, 84.6 per cent. Offering new courses and major reorganization of the curriculum had 100 per cent continuation rates. Associations were significant at the .001 level. This analysis is shown in Table 26.

TABLE 26

COMPARISONS OF MAJOR PROGRAM EMPHASES IN PROJECTS BY CONTINUATION CATEGORIES, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Major Emphasis	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
New courses	18	6.8	0	0.0	6	5.3	5	6.0	5	17.2	2	11.1
Retraining	38	14.3	2	9.5	19	16.6	10	12.0	5	17.2	2	11.1
Major reorg.	18	6.8	0	0.0	8	7.0	6	7.3	2	6.9	2	11.1
Supple. Servs.	99	37.5	11	52.3	50	43.9	30	36.1	5	17.2	3	16.7
Comm. Integ.	7	2.6	1	4.8	3	2.6	2	2.4	1	3.5	0	0.0
New Technology	39	14.7	1	4.8	13	11.4	12	14.5	5	17.2	8	44.4
Guid. Servs.	20	7.5	3	14.3	9	7.9	6	7.3	2	6.9	0	0.0
Plan., Eval., and Diss.	13	4.9	2	9.5	4	3.5	4	4.8	3	10.4	0	0.0
Spec. Educ.	13	4.9	1	4.8	2	1.8	8	9.6	1	3.5	1	5.6
Totals	265	100.0	21	100.0	114	100.0	83	100.0	29	100.0	18	100.0

Chi Square = 39.67 $p < .001$ C = .373

TABLE 26 -- Continued

Major Emphasis (1)	Totals (2)	Number Continued (3)	Number Discontinued (4)	Per Cent Continued (5)
New courses	18	18	0	100.0
Retraining	38	36	2	94.7
Major reorganization	18	18	0	100.0
Supplementary services	99	88	11	88.9
Community integration	7	6	1	85.7
New technology	39	38	1	97.4
Guidance services	20	17	3	85.0
Planning, evaluation, and dissemination	13	11	2	84.6
Special education	13	12	1	92.3
Totals	265	244	21	92.1

The emphases are about the same whether serving urban, rural, or combined classes of pupils. Table 55, page 268, has this analysis. The emphasis in projects also varied little between those selected as most innovative and those not selected. Table 84, page 299, has this analysis.

Participation by Grade Level

Superintendents were asked to check whether the project served elementary or secondary level. Elementary as the grade level of the project was checked 219 times or 41.4 per cent of the 529 responses on this item. Secondary was checked 191 times for 36.1 per cent. Other was checked 119 times for 22.5 per cent. The average project was checked in at least two of the three categories. Elementary was checked 44.4 per cent of the times by discontinued projects; 41.0 per cent by "smaller scale;" 41.8 per cent by "same;" 41.9 per cent by "larger;" and 39.0 per cent by "all." This analysis is shown in Table 27, page 148. No significant association could be made between the continuation and grade level of the project.

There were also no significant variations among responses on this item by urban/rural or by most innovative/less innovative categories. Table 56, page 269, and Table 85, page 300, have these analyses.

Participation in the Project

Superintendents were asked to indicate whether students, teachers, principals, the superintendent, parents or other citizens, or school board members had participated in the

TABLE 27

CONTINUATION OF PROJECTS BY GRADE LEVELS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Grade Level	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Elementary (K - 8)	219	41.4	16	44.4	98	41.0	67	41.9	21	41.2	16	39.0
Secondary (9 - 12)	191	36.1	11	30.6	84	35.1	60	37.5	22	43.1	14	34.2
Other	119	22.5	9	25.0	57	23.9	33	20.6	8	15.7	11	26.8
Totals*	529	100.0	36	100.0	239	100.0	160	100.0	51	100.0	41	100.0

*The total is greater than 256 because the respondent was asked to check all appropriate grade levels.

Chi Square $=$ 3.11 $\quad$ $p < .95$ $\quad$ $C = 0.077$

development of the project in such a manner as to influence its content and operation. Differences were noted as follows: Students were involved 46.0 per cent of the time; teachers, 94.0 per cent; principals, 90.0 per cent; superintendents, 94.0 per cent; parents, 68.0 per cent; and school boards, 68.0 per cent. In projects discontinuing, students, school board, and parents had lower percentages of participation--48.0 per cent, 60.0 per cent, and 63.0 per cent respectively--than teachers, principals, and superintendents. Participation of students was about the same in both continued and discontinued projects, except it was considerably higher in projects that were to continue on a larger scale. School board participation was considerably higher on projects to be continued at "larger" and to "all appropriate pupils."

At 8 degrees of freedom, a chi square of 15.51 was required for a .05 level of significance. The chi square scores and contingency coefficients on association of personnel participation to continuation of the projects were as follows:

Personnel	Chi Square	C
Students	10.731	0.20
Teachers	5.553	0.147
Principals	5.335	0.146
Superintendents	6.670	0.162
Parents	3.124	0.114
School board	12.352	0.221

Table 28, pages 150, 151, and 152, shows this analysis.

The same trends were noted on these items between

TABLE 28

PARTICIPATION IN PROJECT DEVELOPMENT BY SELECTED PERSONNEL IN THE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Personnel Participation	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Students												
Yes	110	46.0	10	48.0	45	44.0	32	43.0	18	67.0	5	39.0
No	119	50.0	10	48.0	54	53.0	40	53.0	9	33.0	6	46.0
Don't know	9	4.0	1	4.0	3	3.0	3	4.0	0	0.0	2	15.0
Totals	238	100.0	21	100.0	102	100.0	75	100.0	27	100.0	13	100.0
		Chi Square = 10.73			$p < .30$		C = 0.20					
Teachers												
Yes	238	94.0	18	86.0	100	93.0	75	94.0	27	100.0	18	100.0
No	15	6.0	3	14.0	7	7.0	5	6.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Don't know	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals	253	100.0	21	100.0	107	100.0	80	100.0	27	100.0	18	100.0
		Chi Square = 5.55			$p < .70$		C = 0.147					

TABLE 28 -- Continued

Personnel Participation	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Principals												
Yes	221	90.0	20	95.0	93	89.0	67	87.0	25	93.0	17	100.0
No	23	9.0	1	5.0	11	11.0	9	12.0	2	7.0	0	0.0
Don't know	1	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals	245	100.0	21	100.0	104	100.0	77	100.0	27	100.0	17	100.0
		Chi Square = 5.33			$p < .80$		$C = 0.146$					
Superintendent												
Yes	234	94.0	19	90.0	101	96.0	72	92.0	24	89.0	18	100.0
No	14	5.6	2	10.0	3	3.0	6	8.0	3	11.0	0	0.0
Don't know	1	0.4	0	0.0	1	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals	249	100.0	21	100.0	105	100.0	78	100.0	27	100.0	18	100.0
		Chi Square = 6.67			$p < .70$		$C = 0.162$					

TABLE 28 -- Continued

Personnel Participation	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Parents, or other citizens												
Yes	160	68.0	12	63.0	71	68.0	49	65.0	17	71.0	11	79.0
No	62	26.0	6	32.0	26	25.0	23	31.0	5	21.0	2	14.0
Don't know	14	6.0	1	5.0	7	7.0	3	4.0	2	8.0	1	7.0
Totals	236	100.0	19	100.0	104	100.0	75	100.0	24	100.0	14	100.0
			Chi Square = 3.12		$p < .95$		C = 0.114					
School board												
Yes	164	68.0	12	60.0	71	68.0	48	63.0	20	77.0	13	93.0
No	62	26.0	8	40.0	24	23.0	25	33.0	4	15.0	1	7.0
Don't know	14	6.0	0	0.0	9	9.0	3	4.0	2	8.0	0	0.0
Totals	240	100.0	20	100.0	104	100.0	76	100.0	26	100.0	14	100.0
			Chi Square = 12.35		$p < .20$		C = 0.221					

innovative and less-innovative projects, though it was noted that urban projects consistently had higher participation percentages on all items except teachers. Superintendents and parents had a statistically significant higher participation in project development in projects serving rural pupils. Table 57, pages 270 and 271, and Table 86, pages 301 and 302, have these analyses.

Cost Per Pupil

The per pupil cost of the project was analyzed to determine possible association with continuation. The mean cost per pupil for discontinued projects was $179. For those continuing on a smaller scale, $106; on same scale, $186; larger scale, $141; and continued to all appropriate, $132. Continued projects in all four categories had a larger per cent in the lowest per pupil cost range that is, $1 - $25. A comparison between "continued on same scale," and "discontinued," $186 versus $179, indicated no significant difference. However there was a difference between "continued on a smaller scale," and "discontinued," $106 versus $179. The average per pupil cost of the total of the continued projects was $141 as compared to $179 for discontinued projects. A higher per pupil cost seemed to be a factor in a project's discontinuation, even though three discontinued projects, or 15 per cent, were in the $500 to $1,000 cost range. The associations were not statistically significant at the .05 level. Table 29, page 154, shows this analysis.

The mean per pupil costs of urban versus rural projects were computed at $180 and $149 respectively, with combined at

TABLE 29

NUMBERS, PER CENTS, AND MEANS OF CONTINUATION OF PROJECTS BY EIGHT RANGES OF PER PUPIL COST

Per Pupil Cost	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
$ 1 - $ 25	113	47.7	6	31.5	55	56.1	30	39.4	13	52.0	9	47.3
26 - 100	59	24.9	5	26.3	21	21.4	24	31.6	5	20.0	4	21.1
101 - 200	22	9.3	5	26.3	9	9.2	5	6.6	1	4.0	2	10.5
201 - 300	10	4.2	0	0.0	4	4.1	3	3.9	2	8.0	1	5.3
301 - 500	9	3.8	0	0.0	4	4.1	1	1.3	2	8.0	2	10.5
501 - 700	7	3.0	1	5.3	0	0.0	4	5.3	1	4.0	1	5.3
701 - 900	6	2.5	1	5.3	1	1.0	4	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
901 & over	11	4.6	1	5.3	4	4.1	5	6.6	1	4.0	0	0.0
Totals	237	100.0	19	100.0	98	100.0	76	100.0	25	100.0	19	100.0
Means			$179		$106		$186		$141		$132	

Chi Square $= 27.36$ $p < .50$ $C = 0.322$

$104. Both rural and combined projects cost considerably less per pupil. The association was significant at the .02 level. The most innovative projects also were found to cost considerably more per pupil on the average, $246 versus $128 for all others. Table 58, page 272, and Table 87, page 303, have these analyses.

Perceptions of the Innovation

Superintendents were asked to reply as to whether the projects' innovations were "highly visible," "compatible with system values," "easily understood," "divisible," and "communicable to others." Their perception of these traits in the project's innovation were as follows: 198 superintendents, or 81.0 per cent, rated their program as highly visible; 206, or 84.0 per cent, rated them as compatible with past experience, training, and values of those who must implement the program; 238, or 96.0 per cent, said that the concepts, methods, and materials used in the program were easily understood, relatively advantageous, or easily understood by those who must implement them; 220, or 89.0 per cent said that the program was divisible or could be operated without greatly disturbing routines of personnel in the school system; and 245, or one less than a 100 per cent, replied that the results of the program could be explained easily to others who were to adopt it.

Significantly, 7, or 35.0 per cent, of the projects discontinued were rated as not "highly visible." This was a higher percentage than for the continued projects, which were as follows: "smaller scale," 21.0 per cent; "same," 14.0 per cent; "larger," 12.0 per cent; and "to all," 10.0 per cent. All the discontinued projects indicated that the programs were compatible and were easily understood. All but one said the programs operated without disturbing the school routine. None of the associations to continuation were quite significant at the .05 level. Table 30, pages 157, 158, and 159, shows this analysis.

All of the innovations in urban projects were rated "easily understood". Those in rural projects were rated "no" on this item 7 per cent of the times. Urban projects rated lowest on "visibility." Combined projects rated lowest on "compatibility;" rural projects rated lowest in "divisibility." This analysis is shown in Table 59, page 273. The most innovative projects received the lowest rating on divisibility, which meant that they were more often the kinds of projects which disturbed the routines of the staff. The association of trait to innovativeness was significant at the .01 level. On all other traits, no significant differences were evident between most innovative and less innovative projects. This analysis is shown in Table 88, page 304.

Social System Variables

Eight characteristics of the school and community were selected for analysis to determine possible associations with continuation of projects. These characteristics included expenditure per child, size of enrollment, educational level, family income, source of superintendents, past innovativeness,

TABLE 30

SUPERINTENDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED TRAITS OF PROJECT INNOVATIONS, NUMBERS, AND PER CENTS OF RESPONSES BY CONTINUATION CATEGORIES

Project Traits	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Highly Visible												
Yes	198	81.0	13	65.0	81	79.0	65	86.0	22	88.0	17	90.0
No	45	19.0	7	35.0	22	21.0	11	14.0	3	12.0	2	10.0
Totals	243	100.0	20	100.0	103	100.0	76	100.0	25	100.0	19	100.0
			Chi Square = 6.48			$p < .20$		C = 0.161				
Easily Understood												
Yes	238	96.0	20	100.0	98	93.0	74	95.0	27	100.0	19	100.0
No	11	4.0	0	0.0	7	7.0	4	5.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals	249	100.0	20	100.0	105	100.0	78	100.0	27	100.0	19	100.0
			Chi Square = 4.40			$p < .30$		C = 0.132				

TABLE 30 -- Continued

Project Traits	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Divisibility												
Yes	220	89.0	19	95.0	89	86.0	72	91.0	23	89.0	17	90.0
No	28	11.0	1	5.0	15	14.0	7	9.0	3	11.0	2	10.0
Totals	248	100.0	20	100.0	104	100.0	79	100.0	26	100.0	19	100.0
			Chi Square = 2.28			$p < .70$		C = 0.096				
Compatibility												
Yes	206	84.0	19	100.0	79	77.0	67	86.0	23	89.0	17	90.0
No	39	16.0	0	0.0	24	23.0	11	14.0	3	11.0	2	10.0
Totals	245	100.0	19	100.0	103	100.0	78	100.0	26	100.0	19	100.0
			Chi Square = 8.56			$p < .10$		C = 0.184				

TABLE 30 -- Continued

Project Traits	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Note Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Communicability												
Yes	245	100.0	20	100.0	102	100.0	77	98.7	27	100.0	19	100.0
No	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals	246	100.0	20	100.0	102	100.0	78	100.0	27	100.0	19	100.0

Chi Square $= 2.16$ $p < .80$ $C = 0.093$

superintendent's influence, and community climate.

Expenditure Per Child

The mean expenditure per child in the school districts continuing Title III projects was $610. This compared with $592 for the discontinued projects. School districts continuing the projects to "all appropriate pupils" had the highest mean per pupil expenditure, $684 as compared to $623 for "larger scale;" $606 for "same scale;" $609 for "smaller scale;" and $592 for discontinued projects.

Nine projects were being discontinued by school districts with more than $600 per child expenditure, representing 47.3 per cent of the discontinuations. Associations were significant at the .001 level. Table 31, page 161, shows this analysis.

Urban districts had a mean of $668 per child, while rural districts had a mean of $592. The combined category had a mean of $601. Association between expenditure and population served was significant at the .05 level. Table 60, page 274, has this analysis.

There was little difference between the mean per pupil expenditure for schools with innovative projects, $618, and that of the less innovative projects, $612. Table 89, page 305, has this analysis.

Size of Enrollment

Because an examination of the returns indicated some multiple-district project superintendents may have been confused about what to include on this item, it was decided to analyze

TABLE 31

CONTINUATION OF PROJECTS BY PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS, NUMBERS, PER CENTS, AND MEANS

Average Per Pupil Expenditure (A.D.M.)	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
$ 1 - $299	6	2.5	0	0.0	4	4.2	0	0.0	1	3.9	1	5.6
300 - 349	9	3.8	1	5.3	2	2.1	2	2.6	3	11.5	1	5.6
350 - 499	49	20.8	4	21.0	20	21.1	21	27.0	1	3.9	3	16.6
500 - 549	31	13.1	1	5.3	11	11.6	14	17.9	5	19.2	0	0.0
550 - 599	28	11.9	4	21.0	10	10.5	11	14.1	2	7.7	1	5.6
600 - 649	29	12.3	2	10.5	18	18.9	5	6.4	3	11.5	1	5.6
650 - 699	16	6.8	3	15.8	6	6.3	4	5.1	1	3.9	2	11.1
700 - 749	13	5.5	0	0.0	7	7.4	5	6.4	1	3.9	0	0.0
750 - 799	16	6.8	3	15.8	2	2.1	4	5.1	5	19.2	2	11.1
800 & over	39	16.5	1	5.3	15	15.8	12	15.4	4	15.3	7	38.8
Totals	236	100.0	19	100.0	95	100.0	78	100.0	26	100.0	18	100.0
Means			$592		$609		$606		$623		$684	

Chi Square $= 59.44$ $p < .001$ $C = 0.449$

multiple-district and single district projects separately on this item.

Superintendents reported that the mean enrollment in 141 single-district Title III projects was 2,106 pupils. The mean enrollment in 11 discontinued projects was 1,357, while the mean for continued projects was 2,169. The mean enrollment among the four levels of continuation were as follows: "smaller" 1,784; "same" 2,492; "larger" 1,866; and "all" 3,478.

All discontinued projects serving a single school district had enrollments of under 6,999, and more than half, 54.5 per cent, served school districts with an enrollment of less than 1,000.

With one exception, all projects in the single district analysis were in school districts with enrollments of less than 13,000 pupils. Returns from large systems including New York and Los Angeles came in too late to be included in the computer analysis. Table 32, page 163, has this analysis.

Fifty-one or 78.5 per cent of the 65 rural projects were from areas of enrollments of less than 1,000. The rural mean was 664. Eleven or 24.4 per cent of the urban districts had enrollments under 999. The association was significant at the .001 level. The urban mean was 3,146 and the rural mean was 664. Table 61, page 275, has this analysis. Fifty-five per cent, or 66 of the less innovative projects were in school districts of less than 999. None of the most innovative were in school districts of above 10,000. Innovative schools had a mean enrollment of 2,402, while less innovative had a mean of

TABLE 32

CONTINUATION PROJECTS SERVING A SINGLE SCHOOL DISTRICT BY SIZE OF ENROLLMENTS, NUMBERS, PER CENTS, AND MEANS

Currently Enrolled K - 12 (A.D.M.)	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1- 999	72	51.1	6	54.5	35	57.4	22	45.8	4	33.3	5	55.6
1,000- 3,999	44	31.2	4	36.4	18	29.5	14	29.1	7	58.4	1	11.1
4,000- 6,999	13	9.2	1	9.1	5	8.2	6	12.5	1	8.3	0	0.0
7,000- 9,999	7	5.0	0	0.0	2	3.3	3	6.3	0	0.0	2	22.2
10,000-12,999	4	2.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.3	0	0.0	1	11.1
13,000-15,999	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
16,000-18,999	1	0.7	0	0.0	1	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
19,000-21,999	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
22,000-24,999	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
25,000-99,999	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals	141	100.0	11	100.0	61	100.0	48	100.0	12	100.0	9	100.0
Means	2,106		1,357		1,784		2,492		1,866		3,478	

Chi Square $= 14.44$ $p < .90$ $C = 0.31$

2,030. Table 90, page 306, has this analysis.

The multiple-district project data may be not reliable, since superintendents seemed to vacillate between providing the total enrollment for all school districts served by the project and as opposed to the enrollment of their school district only. However, the means follow the same trend as those in single districts.

Discontinued projects serving multiple school districts reported a mean of 5,551, as compared to 6,010 for "smaller," 6,654 for "same," 6,902 for "larger," and 5,622 for "continued for all appropriate." Table 33, page 165, has this analysis.

Rural projects serving multiple school districts had a mean of 2,284 as compared to 7,463 and 9,986 for urban and combined categories. Significance was at the .01 level. The most innovative projects in multiple school districts had a mean of 8,266 as compared to 5,765 for less innovative. Table 62, page 276, and Table 91, page 307, have these analyses.

Educational Level

The educational level of the community was ascertained through an item asking for the per cent of the last three high school graduating classes entering college. The 230 projects responding on this item were fairly evenly distributed through the six percentage ranges as follows: 0 - 10 per cent to college, none; 11 - 30 per cent to college, 23 or 10.0 per cent; 31 - 50 per cent to college, 95 or 41.3 per cent; 51 - 70 to college, 81 or 35.2 per cent; 71 - 90 per cent to college, 30 or 13.1 per cent; and 91 - 100 per cent to college, 1 or .4 per

TABLE 33

CONTINUATION OF PROJECTS SERVING MULTIPLE SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY SIZE OF ENROLLMENTS, NUMBERS, PER CENTS, AND MEANS

Number Enrolled K - 12 (A.D.M.)	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1- 9,999	83	79.8	7	77.8	33	78.6	27	90.1	9	69.2	7	70.0
10,000-19,999	13	12.5	0	0.0	6	14.3	0	0.0	4	30.8	3	30.0
20,000-29,999	5	4.8	2	22.2	2	4.8	1	3.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
30,000-39,999	2	1.9	0	0.0	1	2.3	1	3.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
40,000-49,999	1	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
50,000 & over	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals	104	100.0	9	100.0	42	100.0	30	100.0	13	100.0	10	100.0
Means			5,551		6,010		5,654		6,902		5,622	

Chi Square $= 14.84$ $p < .70$ $C = 0.35$

cent. The "discontinuations" clustered in the 71 - 90 per cent range. Only one project, a continuation, was in a community where the per cent of pupils attending college was 90 - 100 per cent. Eighty-eight per cent of the projects extended to serve all pupils were in communities where 51 - 90 per cent of the pupils went to college. Those projects continued on a larger scale had 56.5 per cent in that bracket. The associations were significant at the .01 level. Table 34, page 167, has this analysis.

Urban projects had a greater per cent going on to college. Also projects selected as most innovative were in communities with greater percentages going on to college. Table 63, page 277, and Table 92, page 308, have these analyses.

Family Income

Two hundred thirty-seven respondents checked an item indicating the income level of communities with projects. The projects were distributed normally among the six income classifications as follows: Under $3,000, 6 for 2.5 per cent; $3,000 - $4,999, 53 for 22.4 per cent; $5,000 - $9,999, 148 for 62.4 per cent; $10,000 - $14,999, 24 for 10.6 per cent; and $15,000 and over, 5 for 2.1 per cent. In each category of continuation, communities with higher incomes had a slightly greater per cent of continuations. The variations were significant at the .01 level. Table 35, page 168, has this analysis.

Projects serving rural constituents were located in significantly lower income areas than were urban projects. More innovative projects were also in the higher income areas though

TABLE 34

CONTINUATION OF PROJECTS BY PER CENT OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATING CLASSES ENTERING COLLEGES, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Percentage Entering College	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
0 - 10	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
11 - 30	23	10.0	7	36.8	6	6.1	8	11.0	1	4.4	1	5.9
31 - 50	95	41.3	6	31.6	46	47.0	33	45.2	9	39.1	1	5.9
51 - 70	81	35.2	5	26.3	34	34.7	22	30.1	10	43.5	10	58.8
71 - 90	30	13.1	1	5.3	11	11.2	10	13.7	3	13.0	5	29.4
91 - 100	1	0.4	0	0.0	1	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals	230	100.0	19	100.0	98	100.0	73	100.0	23	100.0	17	100.0

Chi Square $= 33.0$ $p < .01$ $C = 0.35$

TABLE 35

CONTINUATION OF PROJECTS BY INCOME LEVELS OF CONSTITUENTS IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Income Levels	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Under $3,000	6	2.5	1	5.0	3	3.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	11.1
3,000- 4,999	53	22.4	5	25.0	25	26.1	15	19.5	6	23.1	2	11.1
5,000- 9,999	148	62.4	13	65.0	57	59.4	55	71.4	16	61.5	7	38.9
10,000-14,999	25	10.6	1	5.0	10	10.4	6	7.8	4	15.4	4	22.2
15,000 & over	5	2.1	0	0.0	1	1.0	1	1.3	0	0.0	3	16.7
Totals	237	100.0	20	100.0	96	100.0	77	100.0	26	100.0	18	100.0

Chi Square $= 37.03$ $p < .01$ $C = 0.37$

the association was not significant at .05 level. Table 64, page 278, and Table 93, page 309, have these analyses.

Source of Superintendents

Superintendents were asked how many of the last three superintendents employed by the school district were from outside the school district. Seventy-two or 28.2 per cent of the 255 responding had employed all three of the last three superintendents from within the system. Analysis showed that 42.9 per cent of the discontinued projects had hired none of their superintendents from outside their system as compared to 26.2 per cent for continued on "smaller scale;" 24.7 per cent on "same scale;" 37.1 per cent on "larger scale" and 26.3 per cent on "extended to all scale." Though the chi square score indicated no significance at the .05 level, there seems to be an association between continuation of projects and hiring superintendents from outside the school system. Table 36, page 170, has this analysis.

Districts with a project serving rural populations had a slightly higher per cent of superintendents hired from outside the system. Combined projects had the higher per cent hired from within the system. The associations were significant at the .05 level. Table 65, page 279, has this analysis.

The most innovative projects had the highest per cents of superintendents hired from outside the system, though the association was not significant at the .05 level. Table 94, page 310, has this analysis.

TABLE 36

CONTINUATION OF PROJECTS BY SOURCE OF SUPERINTENDENTS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Number of the Last Three Superintendents Hired From Outside	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
0	72	28.2	9	42.9	28	26.2	20	24.7	10	37.1	5	26.3
1	63	24.7	8	38.1	27	25.2	21	25.9	4	14.8	3	15.8
2	68	26.7	4	19.0	28	26.2	21	25.9	8	29.6	7	36.8
3	52	20.4	0	0.0	24	22.4	19	23.5	5	18.5	4	21.1
Totals	255	100.0	21	100.0	107	100.0	81	100.0	27	100.0	19	100.0

Chi Square $= 9.75$ $p < .70$ $C = 0.23$

Past Innovativeness

Superintendents were asked to indicate the number of innovations that they had tried in their school district during the past 10 years. One - five was coded as "1;" 6 - 10 as "2;" 11 - 15, as "3;" 16 - 20, as "4;" 21 - 25, as "5;" and 26 and over, as "6;" thus providing an innovation score for comparison with continuations of Title III projects. The tabulation on this item produced a near symetrical distribution curve of 3.6 per cent, 18.6 per cent, 27.1 per cent, 29.9 per cent, 16.7 per cent, and 4.1 per cent reading from "1" through "6" on the innovation scores.

School districts with the lowest number of innovations had a higher per cent of discontinuations. Fifty-five per cent of the discontinuations were in districts that had tried only 6 - 10 innovations. The greater the number of innovations tried the more extensive the continuation of the projects. The association was significant at the .01 level. Table 37, page 172, shows this analysis.

Urban schools had higher innovation scores than rural schools, with 72 per cent reporting 16 and more innovations. Projects serving rural areas had only 28 per cent in the same category. The association was significant at the .001 level. Table 66, page 280, has this analysis.

A high score on the number of innovations tried did not affect the distribution of projects selected as most innovative by USOE. Table 95, page 311, has this analysis.

TABLE 37

CONTINUATION OF PROJECTS BY AMOUNT OF INNOVATIONS ATTEMPTED IN THE PAST, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Number of Innovations Tried Over Last 10 Years	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1 - 5	7	3.6	0	0.0	5	5.6	2	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
6 - 10	41	18.6	11	55.0	18	20.0	10	14.3	1	4.2	1	5.9
11 - 15	59	27.1	3	15.0	28	31.1	19	27.1	5	20.8	4	23.5
16 - 20	69	29.9	4	20.0	28	31.1	25	35.7	9	37.5	3	17.6
21 - 25	36	16.7	1	5.0	8	8.9	12	17.1	8	33.3	7	41.2
26 & over	9	4.1	1	5.0	3	3.3	2	2.9	1	4.2	2	11.8
Totals	221	100.0	20	100.0	90	100.0	70	100.0	24	100.0	17	100.0

Chi Square $= 39.11$ $p < .01$ $C = 0.39$

Superintendent's Influence on Decisions

Superintendents were asked to rate themselves on a three-point scale regarding the proportion of their decisions accepted by the board of education on matters of budget, personnel, construction, and curriculum.

About 96.6 per cent, or 229, said that the board accepted between 67 - 100 per cent of their recommendations on budget items. There was no significant association between this item and the extent of continuation of Title III projects.

About 98.2 per cent, or 231 superintendents, replied that the board of education accepted between 67 - 100 per cent of their recommendations on personnel hired. No significant differences were noted among the various extents of continuations of projects.

About 91.1 per cent, or 195, indicated that the board of education acted favorably between 67 - 100 per cent of the times on their recommendations for construction. Superintendents whose projects were discontinued had 88.2 per cent of their decisions approved on this item, but the difference was not statistically significant.

About 97.3 per cent, or 220, said that the board accepted their recommendation on curriculum changes 67 - 100 per cent of the times, again not statistically significant.

These items in the questionnaire did not seem to discriminate sufficiently to give an indication of the superintendent's ability to affect board decisions, though they do support a general viewpoint that the superintendent is the change agent for the school system. Table 38, pages 175 and 176, provides an analysis.

Superintendents of the most innovative projects rated themselves as having slightly less autonomy in curriculum matters than those with less innovative projects, 93 per cent as compared to 98 per cent. Also all of the urban superintendents rated themselves in the 67 - 100 per cent category on three of these items; budget, personnel, and curriculum decisions. Superintendents of urban projects more often determined construction matters than those of rural projects. Table 67, page 281, and Table 96, page 312, have these analyses.

Community Climate for Change

Superintendents were asked to rate their communities on receptivity to new ideas chosing between two "usually cautious, conservative" or "usually supportive, open-minded." One hundred fifty-seven, or 64.1 per cent, rated their communities "supportive." Eighty-eight, or 35.9 per cent, rated them as "conservative." Communities with "discontinued" projects were rated "conservative" 52.6 per cent of the times, while projects "extended to all appropriate" were rated "conservative" only 10.5 per cent of the time. In other words, communities rated "open-minded" had 89.5 per cent of the "continued for all" projects. The superintendent's perception of his community seemed associated with the continuation of the projects, and was significant at the .05 level. Table 39, page 177, shows this analysis.

Rural projects received a lower per cent of "open-minded"

TABLE 38

CONTINUATION OF PROJECTS BY PROPORTION OF SUPERINTENDENTS' DECISIONS ACCEPTED BY BOARDS OF EDUCATION, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Per Cent of Recommendations Accepted by Board	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Budget items												
0 - 33	2	0.9	0	0.0	2	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
34 - 66	6	2.5	0	0.0	2	2.1	3	3.8	0	0.0	1	5.9
67 - 100	229	96.6	19	100.0	93	95.8	75	96.2	26	100.0	16	94.1
Totals	237	100.0	19	100.0	97	100.0	78	100.0	26	100.0	17	100.0
		Chi Square = 5.46			p < .70			C = 0.15				
Personnel hired												
0 - 33	2	0.9	0	0.0	1	1.1	1	1.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
34 - 66	2	0.9	0	0.0	1	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.9
67 - 100	231	98.2	19	100.0	93	97.8	77	98.7	26	100.0	16	94.1
Totals	235	100.0	19	100.0	95	100.0	78	100.0	26	100.0	17	100.0
		Chi Square = 6.93			p < .70			C = 0.16				

TABLE 38 -- Continued

Per Cent of Recommendations Accepted by Board	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Construction decisions												
0 - 33	5	2.3	0	0.0	3	3.5	2	2.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
34 - 66	14	6.6	2	11.8	5	5.8	5	6.8	2	8.7	0	0.0
67 - 100	195	91.1	15	88.2	78	90.7	67	90.5	21	91.3	14	100.0
Totals	214	100.0	17	100.0	86	100.0	74	100.0	23	100.0	14	100.0
			Chi Square = 3.79		$p < .90$		$C = 0.13$					
Curriculum change												
0 - 33	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
34 - 66	6	2.7	0	0.0	5	5.3	1	1.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
67 - 100	220	97.3	18	100.0	89	94.7	75	98.7	24	100.0	14	100.0
Totals	226	100.0	18	100.0	94	100.0	76	100.0	24	100.0	14	100.0
			Chi Square = 4.63		$p < .80$		$C = 0.14$					

TABLE 39

CONTINUATION OF PROJECTS BY SUPERINTENDENTS' PERCEPTION OF COMMUNITY RECEPTIVITY TO NEW IDEAS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Receptivity to New Ideas	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Usually Cautious, Conservative	88	35.9	10	52.6	41	39.8	29	37.7	6	22.2	2	10.5
Usually Supportive, Open Minded	157	64.1	9	47.4	62	60.2	48	62.3	21	77.8	17	89.5
Totals	245	100.0	19	100.0	103	100.0	77	100.0	27	100.0	19	100.0

Chi Square $= 10.60$ $p < .05$ $C = 0.20$

ratings, 57.4 per cent as compared to 70.7 per cent for urban projects. The most innovative projects also received higher per cents on "open-mindedness," 75.8 per cent as compared to 61.7 per cent for less innovative. Associations were not quite significant at the .05 level. Table 68, page 282, and Table 97, page 313, have these analyses.

Characteristics of the Superintendent

Nine personal characteristics of the superintendent were selected for possible associations with continuation of Title III projects. This included sex, age, educational level, years of experience, place of birth, mobility, attitude, philosophy, and communicative behavior.

All except one of the persons responding to this questionnaire were male, therefore no further analysis was made on the basis of sex.

Age of Superintendent

Superintendents with Title III projects fell into seven age categories: 2, or 0.8 per cent, were 29 or under; 8 or 3.4 per cent were between 30 - 34; 17, or 7.1 per cent, were between 35 - 39; 39, or 16.3 per cent, were between ages of 40 - 44; 55, or 23.0 per cent, were between ages 45 - 49; 40, or 16.7 per cent, were 50 - 54; 46, or 19.3 per cent, were 55 - 59; 32, or 13.4 per cent, were 60 and over. Superintendents of discontinued projects were older than those of continued projects with 52.6 per cent being over 50 years of age as compared to

46.9 per cent for those with continued projects. However, 11, or 68.7 per cent, of the superintendents of projects "extended to all" were over 50 years of age. Age was associated with continuation at the .001 level of significance. Table 40, page 180, shows this analysis.

Superintendents with projects serving rural areas were younger than those with projects serving urban areas. Age differences were significant at the .001 level. Also superintendents of the more innovative projects seemed to be slightly younger than those of less innovative projects. This was also significant at the .001 level. These analyses are found in Table 69, page 283, and Table 98, page 314.

Educational Level of Superintendent

Superintendents indicated their level of educational attainment on a five-point scale of "no degree," "B.A.," "M.A.," "M.A. plus 30 hours," and "Doctorate." All superintendents had degrees; two had a beachelors degree only. Fifty-one, or 21.2 per cent, had a masters degree; 84, or 34.9 per cent, had at least 30 hours beyond a M.A.; and 104 or 43.1 per cent had a doctorate. Discontinued projects had the smallest percentage, 35.0 per cent, of superintendents at the doctorate level. The per cent with the doctorate increased as the extent of continuation increased with the final category, "all appropriate," having 58.8 per cent with doctorates. The association between educational degree attainment and project continuation was not statistically significant at the .05 level. Table 41, page 181, has this analysis.

TABLE 40

CONTINUATION OF PROJECTS BY AGE OF THE SUPERINTENDENTS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Age of the Superintendents	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Under 30	2	0.8	0	0.0	2	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
30 - 34	8	3.4	1	5.3	3	3.0	2	2.5	0	0.0	2	12.4
35 - 39	17	7.1	1	5.3	9	9.1	5	6.2	1	4.0	1	6.3
40 - 44	39	16.3	4	21.0	16	16.2	17	21.3	1	4.0	1	6.3
45 - 49	55	23.0	3	15.8	23	23.2	20	25.0	8	32.0	1	6.3
50 - 54	40	16.7	3	15.8	17	17.2	10	12.5	6	24.0	4	25.0
55 - 59	46	19.3	5	26.3	18	18.2	15	18.8	4	16.0	4	25.0
60 & over	32	13.4	2	10.5	11	11.1	11	13.7	5	20.0	3	18.7
Totals	239	100.0	19	100.0	99	100.0	80	100.0	25	100.0	16	100.0

Chi Square $= 152.39$ $p < .001$ $C = 0.62$

TABLE 41

CONTINUATION OF PROJECTS BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF THE SUPERINTENDENTS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Highest Educational Attainment	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Less than degree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Bachelors	2	0.8	0	0.0	2	2.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Masters	51	21.2	7	35.0	23	23.2	13	16.2	5	20.0	3	17.7
Masters plus 30 hours	84	34.9	6	30.0	35	35.4	30	37.5	9	36.0	4	23.5
Doctorate	104	43.1	7	35.0	41	41.4	35	43.8	11	44.0	10	58.8
Totals	241	100.0	20	100.0	99	100.0	80	100.0	25	100.0	17	100.0

Chi Square $= 9.35$ $p < .70$ $C = 0.19$

Urban superintendents had a higher percentage at higher degree levels than rural--53.7 per cent with doctorate as compared to 29.6 per cent for rural. The association was significant at the .001 level. Table 70, page 284, has this analysis.

Innovative projects had slightly higher percentages at doctorate levels, 50.0 per cent as compared to 41.8 per cent, though these differences were not significant at the .05 level. Table 99, page 315, has this analysis.

Years of Experience

Superintendents were asked to indicate the number of years of experience that they had as superintendents. The 254 responses were tabulated within six intervals. Twenty-three or 9.1 per cent had had no previous years of experience; 64, or 25.2 per cent had 1 - 4 years of experience; 45, or 17.7 per cent had 5 - 9 years; 51, or 20.1 per cent had 10 - 14 years; and 46, or 18.1 per cent had 20 years and over.

Projects continuing "on smaller scale" had the smallest proportion of superintendents with 15 or more years of experience, 21.0 per cent, as compared to 33.3 per cent for "discontinued" projects; 30.9 per cent for "same;" 46.4 per cent with "larger scale;" and 26.4 per cent for extended to "all appropriate pupils." Generally the more experience the superintendent had the more likely the project would continue and be significantly expanded. The chi square significance was at the .001 level. Table 42, page 183, has the analysis.

Superintendents with least experience had projects serving

TABLE 42

CONTINUATION OF PROJECTS BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AS A SUPERINTENDENT, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Years of Experience	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
None	23	9.1	2	9.5	11	10.5	4	4.9	3	10.7	3	15.8
1 - 4	64	25.2	9	42.9	25	23.8	23	28.4	3	10.7	4	21.0
5 - 9	45	17.7	2	9.5	22	20.9	14	17.3	4	14.3	3	15.8
10 - 14	51	20.1	1	4.8	26	24.8	15	18.5	5	17.9	4	21.0
15 - 19	25	9.8	3	14.3	4	3.8	12	14.8	4	14.3	2	10.6
20 & over	46	18.1	4	19.0	17	16.2	13	16.1	9	32.1	3	15.8
Totals	254	100.0	21	100.0	105	100.0	81	100.0	28	100.0	19	100.0

Chi Square = 164.68 $p < .001$ $C = 0.64$

rural areas. The significance level was .001. Superintendents in more innovative projects were slightly more experienced than the superintendents in the less innovative projects. The associations were significant at the .001 level. Table 71, page 285, and Table 100, page 316, have these analyses.

Place of Birth

Superintendents were asked to indicate their place of birth by rural (farm), small town, urban, and urban (big city). Ninety-seven, or 40.4 per cent, said they were born in a rural (farm) area; 86, or 35.8 per cent, said they were born in a small town; 42, or 17.5 per cent, were born in an urban area; and 15, or 6.3 per cent, were born in a big city. Superintendents born in rural areas had the best overall continuation rate for projects, though those born in big cities were very close. Continuation was not associated with the superintendent's place of birth at the .05 level of significance. Table 43, page 185, shows this analysis.

Superintendents serving rural populations were more likely to have been born in rural areas. Association was significant at the .05 level. The superintendents of the less innovative projects were more likely to be born on a farm. The largest per cent of the most innovative projects had superintendents who were born in small towns. Associations were not significant at the .05 level. Table 72, page 286, and Table 101, page 317, have these analyses.

Superintendents Mobility

Superintendents were asked to indicate the number of

TABLE 43

CONTINUATION OF PROJECTS BY PLACES OF BIRTH OF THE SUPERINTENDENTS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Places of Birth	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Rural (farm)	97	100.0	6	6.2	45	46.4	28	28.9	10	10.3	8	8.2
Small town	86	100.0	7	8.1	32	37.2	31	36.1	11	12.8	5	5.8
Urban	42	100.0	6	14.3	16	38.1	12	28.6	4	9.5	4	9.5
Urban (big city)	15	100.0	1	6.7	4	26.6	9	60.0	1	6.7	0	0.0
Totals	240	100.0	20	8.3	97	40.4	80	33.4	26	10.8	17	7.1

Chi Square $= 10.89$ $p < .70$ $C = .20$

times they had moved since college, excluding military moves. Analysis showed that 102 or 43.0 per cent, had moved 1 - 3 times; 96 or 40.5 per cent, 4 - 6 times; 36 or 15.2 per cent, 7 - 10 times; 2 or 0.9 per cent, 11 - 16 times; 1 or 0.4 per cent, 16 or more times.

Superintendents of projects discontinuing had moved fewer times than others. For example, eleven or 61.1 had moved 1 - 3 times. The association between the number of moves by the superintendent and the continuation of projects was not quite significant at the .05 level. Table 44, page 187, shows this analysis.

Differences were not significant between rural and urban projects nor between innovative and less innovative projects, though superintendents of innovative projects had moved slightly more often than those with less innovative projects. Table 73, page 287, and Table 102, page 318, have these analyses.

A measure of cosmopolitianess was sought through an item asking how many educational meetings superintendents had attended outside their state during the past three years. Twelve or 5.0 per cent indicated that they had been to no meetings outside the state; 86, or 35.5 per cent, had been to 1 - 5 meetings; 79, or 32.6 per cent had been to 6 - 10 meetings; 31, or 12.8 per cent, had been to 11 - 15 meetings; and 34, or 14.1 per cent, had been to 16 or more meetings. Superintendents of discontinued projects had attended fewer meetings than those with continued projects with only 15.0 per cent in 11 - 15 and 16 and over bracket as compared to 24.2

TABLE 44

CONTINUATION OF PROJECTS BY NUMBERS OF TIMES SUPERINTENDENTS CHANGED COMMUNITIES SINCE LEAVING COLLEGE, EXCLUDING MILITARY, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Number of Times Moved	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1 - 3	102	43.0	11	61.1	39	40.6	35	43.7	13	50.0	4	23.5
4 - 6	96	40.5	5	27.8	39	40.6	32	40.0	10	38.5	10	58.8
7 - 10	36	15.2	2	11.1	18	18.8	11	13.7	3	11.5	2	11.8
11 - 15	2	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
16 or more	1	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.9
Totals	237	100.0	18	100.0	96	100.0	80	100.0	26	100.0	17	100.0

Chi Square $= 23.79$ $p < .10$ $C = 0.30$

per cent, 27.5 per cent, 30.8 per cent, and 47.0 per cent for the four categories of continuation projects.

As the degree of continuation increased the number of meetings attended by superintendents increased. The chi square showed no significance at the .05 level. Table 45, page 189, presents this analysis.

No significant differences were noted between urban and rural projects on this variable, though urban project superintendents had 23.6 per cent in the 16 and over category as compared to 9.6 per cent and 12.9 per cent for rural and combined. Table 74, page 288, has this analysis.

Innovative projects had significant variations however, with none in the "no meetings" category as compared to 5.6 per cent for the less innovative; 19.4 per cent in "1 - 5" meetings category, as compared to 38.0 per cent for the less innovative, and 26 per cent in "16 and over" meetings category, as compared to 12.2 per cent for less innovative projects. Association was significant at the .05 level. Table 103, page 319, has this analysis.

Attitudes Toward New Ideas

Superintendents were asked to respond to five statements concerning their attitudes toward new ideas by checking the one that best described their own attitude. One hundred sixteen, or 47.9 per cent, of the superintendents said that they were willing to try almost any new idea even though they knew that there were serious risks involved; 66, or 27.3 per cent, said they would be willing to try an innovation if it had been

TABLE 45

CONTINUATION OF PROJECTS BY NUMBERS OF MEETINGS ATTENDED BY SUPERINTENDENTS OUTSIDE THE STATE DURING PAST THREE YEARS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Number of Meetings	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
None	12	5.0	3	15.0	4	4.1	4	5.0	1	3.8	0	0.0
1 - 5	86	35.5	7	35.0	33	33.3	26	32.5	13	50.0	7	41.2
6 - 10	79	32.6	7	35.0	38	38.4	28	35.0	4	15.4	2	11.8
11 - 15	31	12.8	1	5.0	13	13.1	10	12.5	4	15.4	3	17.6
16 & over	34	14.1	2	10.0	11	11.1	12	15.0	4	15.4	5	29.4
Totals	242	100.0	20	100.0	99	100.0	80	100.0	26	100.0	17	100.0

Chi Square $= 18.17$ $p < .40$ $C = 0.26$

tested in at least one place. Sixty, or 24.8 per cent, said that they had reservations about some of today's innovations, but would try those that seemed to be accepted. None checked the two other statements, that is, "I sincerely feel that most of today's innovations are fads and that it is wise to wait before trying them myself," and "I sincerely believe that there is little need to innovate since we already know more about improving education than we can possibly do."

The first statement was intended to describe an "innovator;" the second statement "an early adopter;" the third statement one of the "early majority adopters;" the fourth statement one of the "late majority adopters;" and the fifth statement "a laggard."

The analysis of replies by continuation of the projects revealed that "discontinued" projects had fewer responses, 6, or 30.0 per cent, on the innovator's statement and more, 9, or 45.0 per cent, on early majority adopter statement. Conversely, the greater the extent of the continuation, the larger the per cent of responses on innovator's statement. The chi square showed that the associations were not quite statistically significant at the .05 level. The analysis is shown in Table 46, pages 191 and 192.

There were no statistically significant differences among rural and urban projects on these statements, though rural superintendents checked the "early majority" statement 35 times, or 30.7 per cent, and urban checked it 9 times, or 16.1 per cent. Table 75, page 289, has this analysis.

TABLE 46

CONTINUATION OF PROJECTS BY SUPERINTENDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD EDUCATIONAL INNOVATIONS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Attitudes Toward Innovations	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Will try almost any new idea	116	47.9	6	30.0	43	43.9	38	47.4	17	63.0	12	70.6
Will try innovation if tested once. . . .	66	27.3	5	25.0	31	31.6	21	26.3	5	18.5	4	23.5
Have reservations but will try those innovations accepted	60	24.8	9	45.0	24	24.5	21	26.3	5	18.5	1	5.9

TABLE 46 -- Continued

Attitudes Toward Innovations	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Most of today's innovations are fads	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Little need to innovate	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals	242	100.0	20	100.0	98	100.0	80	100.0	27	100.0	17	100.0

Chi Square $=$ 12.61 $p < .20$ $C = 0.22$

There were not statistically significant differences among the responses of the less innovative and most innovative project superintendents, though only 3, or 9.4 per cent, of the most innovative project superintendents checked the early majority statement as compared to 58, or 27.4 per cent, for the less innovative projects. Eighteen, or 56.2 per cent of most innovative projects checked the innovators statement one as compared to 98, or 46.2 per cent of less innovative projects. Table 104, page 320, has this analysis.

Superintendents' Philosophy

Superintendents were asked to rate themselves on their basic outlook in matters other than school affairs. One hundred forty-five, or 64.2 per cent rated themselves as "liberal" and 81, or 35.8 per cent rated themselves as "conservative." When categorized as to extent of continuation of the projects, superintendents rated themselves as in the following per cents as "liberal": "discontinued" projects, 60.0 per cent; "smaller scale," projects 64.9 per cent; "same scale," 68.1 per cent; "larger scale," 46.2 per cent; and "all," 76.5 per cent. About fifty-four per cent of the superintendents whose project was continuing on a "larger scale" rated themselves "conservative." Associations were not quite significant at the .05 level. Table 47, page 194, shows the analysis.

No statistically significant differences were noted between rural and urban projects though urban superintendents rated themselves as "liberal" 73.5 per cent as compared to 62.8 per cent "liberal" for rural superintendents. Table 76, page

TABLE 47

CONTINUATION OF PROJECTS BY SUPERINTENDENTS' SELF-RATINGS AS LIBERAL OR CONSERVATIVE, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Superintendent's Philosophy	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Liberal	145	64.2	12	60.0	61	64.9	47	68.1	12	46.2	13	76.5
Conservative	81	35.8	8	40.0	33	35.1	22	31.9	14	53.8	4	23.5
Totals	226	100.0	20	100.0	94	100.0	69	100.0	26	100.0	17	100.0

Chi Square $= 5.42$ $p < .20$ $C = 0.15$

290, has this analysis.

Superintendents of innovative projects rated themselves as liberal, 73.3 per cent, while less innovative projects were rated 62.8 per cent liberal. Differences were not significant at the .05 level. Table 105, page 321, has this analysis.

Communications Behavior

Superintendents were asked where they most often went for reliable information about educational innovations on a forced choice between "authoritive written sources" and "knowledgeable people," 76, or 33.8 per cent, checked "written" and 149, or 66.2 per cent, checked "people." The percentages remained about the same among the five continuation options with "discontinued" projects having slightly fewer superintendents relying on written sources 31.6 per cent but with "all appropriate" having the fewest, with 17.6 per cent. Associations were not significant at the .05 level. Table 48, page 196, shows this analysis.

Rural projects had slightly more superintendents relying on written sources, 41.3 per cent as compared to 30.9 per cent for urban. Communication behavior of superintendents with innovative projects was about the same as those with less innovative projects. Neither association was significant at the .05 level. Table 77, page 291, and Table 106, page 322, have these analyses.

TABLE 48

CONTINUATION OF PROJECTS BY COMMUNICATION BEHAVIOR OF THE SUPERINTENDENTS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Sources of Information	Total of Columns (4) Thru (13)		Extent of Continuation									
			No, Not Likely		Yes, Less		Yes, Same		Yes, More		Yes, All	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Authoritative Written Source	76	33.8	6	31.6	32	35.2	26	35.1	9	37.5	3	17.6
Knowledgeable People	149	66.2	13	68.4	59	64.8	48	64.9	15	62.5	14	82.4
Totals	225	100.0	19	100.0	91	100.0	74	100.0	24	100.0	17	100.0

Chi Square $= 2.30$ $p < .70$ $C = 0.10$

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The major purposes of this study included (1) determining the number and the extent of continuation of three-year Title III projects following termination of federal funding, and (2) determining which of selected characteristics might be associated with continuation of these projects. The survey results will be summarized in four sections as follows: (1) Title III as a demonstration program; (2) association of project characteristics with continuation; (3) association of school and community characteristics with continuation; and (4) association of the superintendent's characteristics with continuation.

Summary of Findings

Title III as a Demonstration Program

The survey yielded the following descriptive information regarding the extent of the continuation of Title III projects:

1. Of the 256 responses to the questionnaire, 235, or 91.8 per cent, indicated that the program would continue. Twenty-one, or 8.2 per cent, will terminate. Of the continuations, 107, or 41.8 per cent, will continue on a smaller scale; 81, or 31.6 per cent, will continue on the same scale; 27, or 10.6 per

cent, will continue on a larger scale; and 19, or 7.4 per cent, will continue and be extended to all appropriate pupils in all appropriate schools in the school district.

2. When the results of a telephone follow up of 65 non-respondents were included in the survey, the total number of three-year Title III projects being continued was 279 of the 330, or 84.5 per cent.
3. In 31 states, 100 per cent of the 1966 projects were continued after federal funding ended. Thirteen states were below the 92 per cent average.
4. States comprising the Southern region had a slightly higher discontinuation rate than the other regions. The Northern region had the lowest discontinuation rate.
5. Whether a project served one or served several districts did not seem to affect the total continuation rate significantly, though projects serving multiple districts were more likely to continue on a smaller scale.
6. All projects selected as "most innovative" by USOE personnel and funded the first year of the Title III program were continued by the local schools.
7. Projects serving rural populations had a significantly higher rate of discontinuation, 10.3 per cent, than those serving urban populations, 3.3 per cent.
8. The average project was continued using 1.5 sources of revenue. The local educational agency was the

primary source for continuation funds, with 191 of the 256 projects checking this item. Innovative projects were more likely to be successful in getting support from outside their communities.

9. Superintendents made the recommendation to continue or discontinue the project in 86.3 per cent of the cases. Where they made no recommendation, the Title III projects were discontinued at a 39.2 per cent rate, considerably higher than the rate of 4.9 per cent for projects upon which he made the recommendation.

10. Instructional materials were produced in 77 per cent of the projects. Discontinued projects produced materials in about the same proportion. The more innovative projects produced instructional materials more often than less innovative projects.

11. A total of 256,191 persons visited the projects during the three years. The mean was 1,108 per project. Discontinued projects had slightly more visitors per project than continued projects.

12. As a result of 120 Title III demonstration projects began during fiscal year 1966, 2,460 similar, new programs were begun by other schools. The mean was 20.4 new programs for each demonstration. Discontinued projects also were responsible for stimulating new programs though the mean was 16.0, lower than for the continued projects. One hundred

thirty-six projects did not respond to the item indicating that they did not know how many new programs were started.

13. Continued projects had the largest percentages of local funds in their three-year budgets, 20.9 per cent as compared to 1.4 per cent for discontinued projects.

Effects of Project Characteristics

The survey yielded the following information regarding the association between the characteristics of the program (the innovation) and the continuation rate of the projects.

1. Discontinued projects served a mean of 22,136 persons, as compared to a mean of 66,888 persons served by the average project. The larger the size of the population served, the more likely the project was to be continued.
2. Only 2.7 per cent of the total persons served by the 256 projects were in the discontinued projects.
3. The mean size of the three-year budgets of continued projects was twice the size of discontinued projects, $553,000 as compared to $230,000.
4. Discontinued projects had significantly larger budgets for training, dissemination, and evaluation activities than continued projects. The most innovative projects had a larger percentage of their budgets for training than the less innovative projects. There was some indication that projects which had a

major emphasis on training teachers were more likely to discontinue, probably because the training was completed.

5. Projects which had as a major program emphasis the offering of a supplementary and/or enrichment course or activity accounted for more than half of the discontinuations.
6. Projects with supplementary services were also more likely to be scaled down when they were continued. However there were no significant differences in the continuation rate.
7. The grade levels of the pupils in the projects was not associated with the projects' continuation rate.
8. Where students and school board personnel were "meaningfully involved" in the development of the project, the more likely it was to be continued, particularly in projects expanded to serve larger numbers of persons.
9. The average cost per pupil of continued projects was less than those discontinued, $141 versus $179.
10. The 41.8 per cent of projects which were continued on a smaller scale had a mean per pupil cost of $106 as compared to $179 for discontinued projects.
11. Rural projects cost less per pupil than urban projects, and the most innovative projects cost considerably more per pupil than less innovative projects.
12. Title III projects were rated high on the traits of visibility, compatibility, complexity, divisibility,

and communicability, with no trait receiving less than 80 per cent.

13. Discontinued projects had an overall lower rating on "visibility."
14. All but one project was rated compatible with the values and past experiences of the personnel in the social system.
15. Rural projects were rated lowest on "divisibility." Urban projects were rated lowest on "visibility."

Effects of Social System Variables

The survey yielded the following data regarding the association of system characteristics to continuation of the projects.

1. The mean expenditures per child in school districts continuing projects to "all" and on a larger scale were significantly higher than all other categories of continuation, $684 per child (A.D.M.) as compared to $610 for discontinuations.
2. Urban school districts had larger mean expenditures per child, $668 as compared to $592 for rural districts.
3. School districts with the most innovative projects had a per child expenditure of about the same as less innovative. A mean of $618 as compared to $612 for the school districts with less innovative projects.
4. The mean enrollment in school districts serving a single school district was 2,106 pupils. Continued

projects had a mean of 2,169 as compared to 1,357 for discontinued projects.

5. The mean enrollment of school districts with discontinued projects serving multiple districts was 5,551, as compared to 6,010 for continued on "smaller scale," 6,654 in "same," 6,902 on "larger," and 5,622, to "all appropriate."
6. The higher the educational level of a community, as determined by per cent of graduating classes going on to college, the greater the expansion of the project and the higher the rate of continuation of the projects.
7. Urban projects and the "most innovative" projects were in communities where larger per cents of pupils went on to college.
8. In all categories of continuation, communities with higher incomes had a slightly greater per cent of continuations. Income level was also associated with urban projects and "most innovative" projects.
9. Almost half, 42.9 per cent of the discontinued projects, were in communities that had hired all of their last three superintendents from inside the system.
10. The "most innovative" projects had the highest per cent of superintendents hired from outside the system.
11. The greater the number of innovations tried by school

districts during the recent ten years, the greater the expansion of the projects and the higher the continuation rate of the projects in those school districts.

12. Urban districts had tried a significantly higher number of innovations than rural districts.
13. Superintendents indicated that they had strong influence on budget, personnel, construction, and curriculum decisions by the boards of education. Ninety-five per cent indicated that boards of education accepted 67 - 100 per cent of their recommendations. Superintendents in the most innovative projects indicated that they had slightly less influence on curriculum matters than in the less innovative projects.
14. Where superintendents' perception of their communities was that of being "usually supportive, open-minded to new ideas," the project was more likely to continue.
15. Communities with rural projects were more often rated as conservative and those with "most innovative" projects were more often rated "open-minded."

Effects of the Superintendent's Characteristics

The survey yielded the following information regarding the association of selected characteristics of the projects' superintendents to the continuation of the projects:

1. Younger superintendents had a larger percentage of

projects continued, though older superintendents tended to be more successful with projects extended to all appropriate persons.

2. Projects serving rural areas and those selected as "most innovative" had somewhat younger superintendents than those categorized as urban and less innovative projects.
3. More than 43.1 per cent of superintendents with Title III projects had doctorate degrees, significantly higher than the national average of 21.3 per cent.[1]
4. The extent of continuation of projects was positively associated with the per cent of superintendents with doctorate degrees.
5. Considerably more urban superintendents had doctor's degrees than rural superintendents.
6. The greater the number of years the superintendent had been superintendent, the more likely it was that the project would continue and be significantly expanded.
7. Superintendents with projects serving rural areas had less experience as superintendent than superintendents of projects serving urban areas.
8. Superintendents of the "most innovative" projects had more experience than those of "less innovative" projects.

---

[1] American Association of School Administrators, Selecting a School Superintendent (Washington, D.C., 1968), p. 5.

9. About 76 per cent of the superintendents of Title III projects were born on farms or in small towns.
10. Superintendents born in rural farm areas had the best overall continuation rate for projects though those from big cities were a very close second.
11. The most innovative projects had the largest per cent of their superintendents born on farms.
12. Superintendents whose projects were continued had moved more times since college than superintendents of discontinued projects.
13. Superintendents of the "most innovative" projects had moved more often than those of "less innovative" projects.
14. The number of meetings attended outside the state by superintendents during the past three years was related positively to the per cent and extent of the project's continuation.
15. Superintendents of the "most innovative" projects had attended a significantly larger number of educational meetings outside their state.
16. Almost half of the superintendents of Title III projects said that they would be willing to try almost any new idea even though they knew that there were serious risks involved.
17. The superintendents of projects who checked the item which classified them as "innovators" had more extensive continuation projects.

18. Sixty-four point two per cent of the superintendents of Title III projects indicated that they were "liberals" in matters other than school affairs. No differences were noteworthy between superintendents of continued and discontinued projects.
19. Discontinued projects had superintendents who relied slightly more on personal sources as opposed to written sources for information about educational innovations.

Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations

The following conclusions were drawn from the literature and findings of this study.

1. The adoption rate of ESEA Title III projects exceeded the most optimistic expectations of interested observers. The 85 per cent continuation rate represents a remarkable achievement for a demonstration program exceeding any known adoption rate for educational foundation programs or other federal programs.
2. Three years is a reasonable period of time for an educational demonstration to be adopted by the school system in which it operates. Other studies have indicated that less than two years was probably a waste of federal or foundation funds. Four years might be even more productive if the first year were a "planning" year. It is recommended that the

maximum project period should be no more than five years.

3. The USOE Guidelines for Title III called for the project designs which would meet local needs first, national needs second. The Title III funds were regarded as venture capital. Correctly interpreting the "will of Congress," the USOE put stress on "innovative features," on variability in approaches, and on flexibility toward changes in project strategies and even objectives. Since this policy seems to have served well, it is recommended that the USOE maintain a policy of non-intervention and local initiative, with emphasis on flexibility in approach in present and future programs of this nature.
4. USOE personnel charged with reviewing proposals, monitoring the projects, and general administration of the program were able to select those programs which would be successful. Therefore, by determining which programs are the "most innovative" during the first year of a project, they could with considerable assurance predict which programs would be continued after federal funds were terminated. Further study should be undertaken to determine if these USOE personnel could also predict the few projects that might fail for the purpose of concentrating monitoring efforts to rescue the federal investment in the projects before the three-year period ended.

5. The average successful adoption had a 20 per cent commitment of local funds in its three-year operational budget. Therefore USOE and state agencies should institute a policy of local commitment of funds to the demonstration as a prerequisite to funding, probably on an escalating basis with a first year of 10 - 25 per cent to a final year at 50 per cent, depending upon the project length and local condition.
6. One hundred twenty superintendents reported that the average project stimulated the adoption of 20 similar programs outside their school district. Further analysis of the data should be undertaken to determine if those projects reporting new programs had characteristics or activities different from other projects. Such data could be used to develop criteria for more successful demonstrations.
7. Since the projects proved to be valuable to the local school and, to 20 other schools, the instructional materials developed by 77 per cent of the projects should be evaluated and widely disseminated.
8. Though projects serving rural populations had the largest per cent of the total first year projects, they also had a significantly lower continuation rate. An analysis should be made of rural projects to determine what factors operate to give them a lower continuation rate. The USOE might consider a longer grant period for rural projects to give the

project more time to prove itself.

9. Continued projects, on the average, served larger numbers of pupils, had larger budgets, cost less per pupil, had smaller per cents in their budgets for training, evaluation, and dissemination, and had greater school board and student involvement in their development, and were for activities that were major additions to or reorganizations of the school curriculum. The more innovative the program, the more it cost per pupil. Therefore the following recommendations are made to the USOE and state education agencies:

    (1) In making grants, commit at least $500,000 for at least a three-year period for about 2,000 pupils for a program that will be a major change and innovation in the present system.

    (2) Review all planning, evaluation, and dissemination activities in proposed projects to make certain that they are not out of proportion to the program of the project. Large planning staffs, complicated and prolonged evaluation activities and "slick" dissemination programs may actually hamper the effectiveness of a project.

    (3) Monitor projects in the planning phase to influence meaningful participation of students, school board, and parents in the project's development.

10. Most superintendents perceived the Title III projects to have positive ratings on the traits Everett M. Rogers identified as necessary to ease the implementation of an innovation, i.e. visibility, compatibility, complexity, divisibility, and communicability. Evidently USOE policy of allowing local school districts to develop their own programs acted to maximize the compatibility of the innovation with the system. This would reinforce the first recommendation urging continued "non-intervention" on the part of USOE.
11. School districts were more likely to continue their projects if they had a higher expenditure per child, were in urban areas, had a smaller school enrollment, the project served only one school district, had a higher per cent of high school graduates who went on to college, the superintendent came from outside the system, the district had tried a higher number of innovations and had a "supportive and open-minded" community.

In light of this, the following recommendations to USOE and state educational agencies are made:

(1) In instances where equally good projects are in competition for funds, and where it may be important to demonstrate to a wide area a new program, the grant should be made to the school district with the highest ratings on the above traits.

(2) When contemplating a project for a low-income and relatively disadvantaged or rural area, more attention should be given to the project in terms of planning funds, higher support per child, and opportunity for participation by board of education and the affected students and parents.

12. Superintendents who had the most success with continuation of their projects had the following traits: they were younger, had doctorate degrees, had more years of experience, were born on a farm or in a small town, moved more, attended more out-of-state educational meetings, more often rated themselves as willing to take risks, and regarded themselves as liberals in matters other than that of school affairs. They also said that they relied slightly more on written sources for information about innovations. In light of these findings, the following recommendations are suggested for USOE and state educational agencies administering demonstration programs:

(1) Since the study also supported the common opinion that superintendents are the gatekeepers and the key implementers of change in policy, the USOE should seek information about the characteristics of superintendents to use as part of the criteria in making a choice between otherwise equally desirable sites for the project.

(2) Sponsor on an organized and systematic basis, opportunities for older and more conservative school superintendents to observe innovations in other areas of the nation.

13. Projects serving strictly rural populations differed from those serving urban populations in the following ways: fewer were continued, they cost less per pupil, and were hardest to implement. Rural areas had fewer pupils going on to college, less income, had fewer of the most innovative programs, had tried fewer innovations, and were more conservative. Also the superintendent was younger, had less education and less experience as a superintendent.

The following recommendations might alleviate these apparent handicaps:

(1) Preference should be given to rural superintendents for fellowships at universities with the provision that they return to the rural area for a determined period of time.

(2) Rural communities should be given greater consideration for general financial aid by state and federal governments.

(3) Supplementary educational services should be provided to rural areas through regional centers to encourage and equip rural youth to reinvest their talents in their home areas.

(4) More help should be given to rural demonstration

projects to develop strategies to effect change in their communities.

14. Projects selected by USOE as most innovative had the following traits distinguishing them from less innovative projects. They produced more instructional materials; had more in their budgets for training; cost more per pupil; were more difficult to implement; the school district spent more per pupil on education; more students went to college; had higher incomes; the board had more influence on the curriculum, and the people were more "open-minded." Also the superintendent was younger, was more often hired from outside, had more experience as a superintendent, was born on a farm, had moved more often and had attended more educational meetings.

    Since all of the "most innovative" projects in this study were continued by the school district, the USOE should conduct an in-depth, on-site study of these 33 projects comparing them on several variables with the 21 projects that were discontinued.

This study seemed to lend tentative support to hypotheses posed earlier in this dissertation:

1. The adoption of an innovation is associated with certain characteristics of the innovation including cost, preparation of materials, and others.
2. The adoption of an innovation is related to the

situational or system variables, such as, wealth and community norms.

3. The adoption of an innovation is related to the personal characteristics of the superintendent, such as age and education.
4. A "free" trial period for an innovation speeds up the rate of adoption of the innovation, as has been the case of ESEA Title III.

Suggestions for Further Research

The following topics are suggested for further research and study:

1. A study similar to this one on Title III projects funded in fiscal year 1967 to determine if the same rate of adoption prevails and if the effect of the one-year planning grant can be ascertained.
2. A follow-up study one year hence to determine whether projects that the superintendent indicated were continuing would be continuing beyond one year.
3. An in-depth analysis of evaluation and dissemination activities in projects to determine why projects with larger budgets for these activities had a higher discontinuation rate.
4. A survey of project directors to determine their perception of administrative strategies and comparison with a similar study of the superintendents, school board members, teachers, and selected community leaders.

5. An on-site interview study to determine the change strategies used by successful project operators and superintendents.
6. Application of a multiple regression equation to the variables in this study to determine which of the several variables may be most reliable in predicting the adoption of an innovation by a school district.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Public Documents

President's National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services. Conference on Innovation. September 30 - October 2, 1968.

U.S. Congress. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Public Law 89-10, 89th Cong., 1st sess., H.R. 2362.

________. Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966. Public Law 89-750, 89th Cong., 2d sess., H.R. 13161.

________. Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967. Public Law 90-247, 90th Cong., 2d sess., H.R. 7819.

________. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Aid to Elementary and Secondary Education. Hearings before the General Subcommittee on Education, House of Representatives, on H.R. 2362, 89th Cong., 1st sess., 1965.

________. House. Committee on Government Operations. Operations of the Office of Education. Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, 90th Cong., 1st sess., 1967.

________. House. Committee on Education and Welfare. Aid to Elementary and Secondary Education. Hearings before the General Subcommittee on Education, House of Representatives, on H.R. 2362, 89th Cong., 1st sess., 1965.

________. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966. Hearings before the General Subcommittee on Education, House of Representatives, on H.R. 13160 and H.R. 13161, 89th Cong., 2d sess., 1966.

________. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967. Hearings before the General Subcommittee on Education, House of Representatives, on H.R. 6230, 90th Cong., 1st sess., 1967.

________. House. Committee on Education and Labor. *Extension of Elementary and Secondary Education Program.* Hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, on H.R. 514, 91st Cong., 1st sess., 1969.

________. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. *Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967.* S. Rept. 726, 90th Cong., 1st sess., 1967.

________. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. *Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967 with Background Materials and Tables.* 90th Cong., 2d sess., 1968. Committee Print. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968.

________. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.* Hearings before the Subcommittee on Education, on S. 370, 89th Cong., 1st sess., 1965.

________. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.* S. Rept. 146 To Accompny H. Rept. 2362, 89th Cong., 1st sess., 1965.

________. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1966.* Hearings before the Subcommittee on Education, Senate, on S. 3046, 2778, 2928, and 3012, 89th Cong., 2nd sess., 1966.

________. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. *Educational Legislation.* Hearings before the Subcommittee on Education, on S. 1125 and H.R. 7819, 90th Cong., 1st sess., 1967.

________. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. *Notes and Working Papers Concerning the Administration of Program Authorized Under Title III of Public Law 89-10, The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 As Amended by Public Law 89-750.* 90th Cong., 1st sess., 1967. Committee Print. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *A Manual for Project Applicants: Title III Elementary and Secondary Education Act.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.

________. *PACEsetters in Innovation.* Vols. I - III. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Books

American Association of School Administrators. Selecting a School Superintendent. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators and National School Board Association, 1968.

Benson, Charles S. and Guthrie, James W. A Search for New Energy: ESEA Title III An Essay on Federal Incentives and Local and State Educational Initiative. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, 1968.

Brickell, Henry M. Organizing New York State for Educational Change. Albany: State Education Department, 1961.

Carlson, Richard O. Adoption of Educational Innovations. Eugene: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1965.

Carlson, Richard O., et. al. Change Process in the Public Schools. Eugene: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1965.

Catlin, George. Systematic Politics. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962.

Combs, Arthur and Snygg, Donald. Individual Behavior. New York: Harper and Bros., 1959.

Committee for Economic Development. Innovation in Education: New Directions for the American School. New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1968.

Department of Rural Education. A Guide for Developing PACE. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966.

Goulet, Richard., ed. Educational Change: The Reality and the Promise. New York: Citation Press, 1968.

Havelock, Ronald G. Bibliography on Knowledge Utilization and Dissemination. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, 1968.

Kurland, Norman and Miller, Richard. Selected and Annotated Bibliography of the Processes of Change. Albany, New York: State Education Department, 1966.

Linton, Ralph. The Study of Man. New York: Appleton-Century Croft, Inc., 1936.

Lionberger, Herbert F. Adoption of New Ideas and Practices. Ames: The Iowa State University Press, 1960.

Lippitt, Ronald, *et. al*. *The Dynamics of Planned Change*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1958.

McClelland, William A. *The Process of Effecting Change*. Washington, D.C.: Human Resources Office, The George Washington University, 1968.

Merriam, Charles Edward. *The Role of Politics in Social Change*. New York: New York University Press, 1936.

Miles, Matthew, B., ed. *Innovation in Education*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Morphet, Edgar L. and Ryan, Charles O., ed. *Planning and Effecting Needed Changes in Education*. New York: Citation Press, 1967.

Mort, Paul H. and Cornell, P.G. *American Schools in Transition: How Our Schools Adopt Their Practices to Changing Needs, A Study of Pennsylvania*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941.

Richland, Malcolm. *Final Report: Traveling Seminar and Conference for Implementation of Educational Innovation*. Santa Monica: Systems Development Corp., 1965.

Rogers, Carl R. *Existential Psychology*. New York: Random House, Inc., 1961.

Rogers, Everett M. *Bibliography on Research on the Diffusion of Innovation*. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1968.

__________. *Diffusion of Innovations*. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Ross, D.H., *et. al*. *Administration for Adoptability*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.

Trump, J. Lloyd and Baynam, Dorsey. *Guide to Better Schools: Focus on Change*. Chicago: Rand, McNally and Co., 1961.

Van Dalen, Deobold B. *Understanding Educational Research, An Introduction*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1962.

Woods, Thomas E. *The Administration of Educational Innovation*. Eugene: Bureau of Educational Research, University of Oregon, 1967.

Articles and Periodicals

Cawelti, Gordon. "Does Innovation Make Any Difference?" *Nation's Schools*, November, 1968, pp. 60-63.

________. "Innovation Practices in High Schools," For Inventory of Innovation in 7,237 high schools. Nation's Schools, April, 1967, pp. 56-74.

The Croft Federal Aid Service, No. 60, (October 15, 1968), 1.

Estes, Nolan. "The Intent and Nature of ESEA Title III." Theory Into Practice, TIP, VI (June, 1967), 112-115.

Guthrie, James W. "A Political Case History: Passage of ESEA." Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX, No. 6 (February, 1968), 305.

Hearn, Norman E. "Dissemination: After Bangkok, What?" SRIS Quarterly (1968), 9.

Lippitt, Ronald. "The Use of Social Research to Improve Social Practice." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXXV (July, 1965), 663-669.

North Central Association, Today, May, 1967, p. 1.

"View from the Top: Congressmen Look at Evaluation." PACEreport, November, 1967, pp. 5-8.

Washington Monitor, March 31, 1969, p. 1.

"What Title III Projects Need: More Innovation." Nation's Schools, August, 1966, pp. 42-45.

Unpublished Materials

Childs, John W. "A Study of Belief Systems of Administrators and Teachers in Innovative and Non-innovative School Districts." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965.

Christie, Samuel G. "A Social Analysis of Innovation in Sixteen School Districts." Unpublished paper from the Center for Study of Evaluation, University of California, undated.

Guthrie, James W. "The 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act: The National Politics of Educational Reform." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1967.

Havelock, Ronald G. "Dissemination and Utilization: The State of the Art." Paper presented to a symposium at the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, February 6, 1969.

Hearn, Norman E. "Considerations for Designing a State Strategy for Diffusion of Educational Innovations." Paper read before three Regional Conferences of State Title III Administrators, St. Louis, March 11, 1969; Denver, March 13, 1969; and Hartford, March 19, 1969.

Innovative Centers Branch, Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers, U.S. Office of Education. "One Hundred Project Examples of PACE Projects Selected by Nine Area Desks." SR-67-101, 1967.

Johnson, Homer M. and Marcus, R. Laverne. "Organizational Climate and the Adoption of Educational Innovations." Paper presented at American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, February 5-8, 1969.

Knapp, Dale L. "An Evaluative Study of Curriculum Change in Ohio Schools." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, Ohio State University, 1959.

Kohl, John W. "Adoption Stages and Perceptions of Characteristics of Educational Innovations." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1965.

Miller, Richard I. "Evaluation and PACE: A Study of Procedures and Effectiveness of Evaluation Sections in Approved PACE Projects with Recommendations for Improvement." Second National Study of PACE, Report Number 1, February 29, 1968.

__________. "A Comprehensive Model for Managing an ESEA Title III Project from Conception to Culmination." Second National Study of PACE, Report Number 3, November 10, 1968.

__________. "Analysis and Evaluation of 137 ESEA Title III Planning and Operational Grants." Second National Study of PACE, Report Number 4, November 15, 1968.

__________. "The Views of 920 PACE Project Directors." Second National Study of PACE, Report Number 5, November 20, 1968.

__________. "PACE: Catalyst for Change." Second National Study of PACE, Report Number 6, November 29, 1968.

Murphy, Joseph. "ESEA Title III: Illusion and Reality." Unpublished report, undated.

Polemeni, Anthony John. "A Study of Title III Projects, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 83-53 (89-10), After the Approved Funding Periods." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, School of Education, St. John's University, 1969.

President's National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services. "PACE: Transition of a Concept." January 19, 1969.

Program Analysis Section, Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers, U.S. Office of Education. "Analysis of PACE Proposals by Project Category, First, Second, and Third Periods." R-21, September 2, 1966.

_________. "Highlights from the Second Year of PACE." August 10, 1967.

_________. "A Report to the States As We Begin the Fourth Year of PACE." March, 1969.

_________. "Status Report - ESEA, Title III." March 7, 1969.

Richland, Malcolm. "A Study to Define an Operational Index of Innovation for School Administrators." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1968.

Ross, Paul D. and Halbower, Charles C. "A Model for Innovation Adoption in Public School Districts." Cambridge: Arthur D. Little, Inc., 1968. (Mimeographed.)

Sieber, Sam D. "Images of the Practitioner and Strategies for Inducing Educational Change." New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1967. (Mimeographed.)

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Education. ERIC Documents on Educational Change Processes and Research Utilization, a Report on Projects During July 1966 - May 1968.

APPENDIX A

ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

The first purpose of this descriptive study was to determine the continuation rate by local school districts of educational demonstration projects funded by the U.S. Office of Education under the authority of Title III of Public Law 89-10, The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The second purpose of this study was to investigate what associations, if any, existed between the variable of continuation and selected characteristics of the school systems, the superintendent, and the innovation itself.

The study included a review of the literature on (1) the legislative history of ESEA Title III, (2) evaluative studies of Title III, and (3) selected references on the change process. A 39-item survey instrument was mailed to the superintendents of the total population of 330 projects funded in fiscal year 1966. Two hundred fifty-six questionnaires, representing 80.3 per cent of the population, were returned. Analysis of the collected data was undertaken by five levels of continuation on selected characteristics to test the hypothesis that these characteristics were associated with project continuation after federal funds terminated. The chi square test of statistical significance was applied to the data. The survey

yielded the following findings:

1. Ninety-two per cent of the ESEA Title III projects in the survey were continued following the three-year demonstration period of the federal grant. Eighty-five per cent were continued if the results of a telephone survey of non-respondents was added to the data.
2. The average project was continued using 1.5 sources of revenue with the local school district being the primary source.
3. Projects that were continued had significantly larger local commitment of funds in their three-year budgets.
4. The average project was responsible for stimulating 20 similar new programs in other schools.
5. Continued projects served larger numbers of pupils, had larger budgets, cost less per pupil, allotted smaller per cents of their budgets for training, evaluation, and dissemination, had greater school board and student involvement in their development, and included activities that were major additions to or reorganizations of the school or curriculum.
6. School districts were more likely to continue their projects if they had a higher expenditure per child, were in urban areas, had a smaller school enrollment, served only one school district, had a higher per cent of high school graduates who went to college, had a superintendent who came from outside the system, had

tried a higher number of innovations, and had a "supportive and open minded" community.

7. Superintendents who had the most success with continuation of their projects were younger, were more likely to have doctorate degrees, had more years of experience, were born on a farm or in a small town, moved more often, attended more out-of-state meetings, were more willing to take risks, regarded themselves as "liberals," and relied more on written sources for information about educational innovations.

Recommendations included the following:

1. In administering ESEA Title III and other demonstration programs, the USOE and state educational agencies should continue the minimum, three-year, project period concept.
2. A minimum local commitment of funds to demonstration projects should be required by agencies who fund demonstration or innovative projects.
3. USOE should commit itself to evaluating and disseminating the products and results of demonstration projects.
4. Rural areas and projects in disadvantaged areas should be given special consideration in terms of more extensive technical assistance, larger amounts of funds, and longer period of time for conducting the demonstrations.
5. The characteristics of the school system and the

superintendent should be considered when determining whether a grant for a demonstration project should be given to an applicant school district.

6. An on-site follow up study should be made to validate the findings in this survey.

APPENDIX B

FACSIMILE OF LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS WITH TITLE III PROJECTS SEEKING INFORMATION REGARDING CONTINUATIONS

February, 1969

Dear Superintendent:

Your PACE project is one of about 2,700 funded from the approximately 6,000 applications received during the first three years of Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It is also one of only 300 projects that has survived to complete nearly three years of operation. As such, it is of special interest to the other school administrators and to educational researchers.

This 39-item questionnaire therefore is designed to identify Title III projects which will continue after the Federal grant expires for the purpose of disseminating information about promising new services to rural and urban youth. The Department plans a publication along this line. The questionnaire also seeks information about the unique characteristics of the school, the community, and the superintendent--all of which may influence the adoption of innovations.

This promises to be a landmark study which will attract nationwide interest. Your help will not only be greatly appreciated but it is absolutely vital if the study is to succeed.

Thank you so much for giving it your personal attention.

Sincerely,

Lewis R. Tamblyn
Executive Secretary
Department of Rural Education
National Education Association
1201 Sixteenth Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036

APPENDIX C

FACSIMILE OF QUESTIONNAIRE TO SUPERINTENDENTS WITH TITLE III PROJECTS SEEKING INFORMATION REGARDING CONTINUATIONS

Instructions: The superintendent should complete this questionnaire since most of the questions seek opinions and information that only he can provide. Try to complete the instrument immediately since a publication is planned for early spring.

If you have questions call Norman E. Hearn, the researcher, at 202-963-7383. Please return the questionnaire in the stamped, self-addressed envelope to: Lewis Tamblyn, Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Name of person reporting ______________________________
Official position ____________________ Telephone __________
Name of school district ______________________________
Post office and State ______________________________

A. Basic Information

The abstract below was prepared from information contained in your original application for a ESEA Title III grant. Please read it. If changes are necessary, please make them in the margin.

(ABSTRACT)

1. In your opinion, will the activities of this project be continued in the school district(s) when the Title III grant expires or if already expired, is the program to be continued? (Circle number)

1	2	3	4	5
No or not likely	Yes, on a smaller scale	Yes, on about same scale	Yes, on a larger scale	Yes, extended to all appropriate pupils in all schools

2. If to be continued beyond Federal project period, how will it be funded? (Circle all appropriate)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Local school district funds	Fees from pupils or member schools	Business Industry (ies)	State funds but not Title III	Foundations	A new Federal grant	Other, specify ________ ________ ________ ________

3. Has the project produced curriculum guides, courses of study, or other instructional materials (including films, video tapes, etc.) which might interest other schools with similar programs? (Circle number)

1	2
Yes	No

4. During the past three years, about how many persons (if any) have visited your project from other communities? (Give number below)

____

5. How many schools do you know of who have introduced similar programs after visiting your project? (Write number below)

____

6. Did you make a recommendation which led to the decision to continue (or discontinue) the project? (Circle number)

1	2
Yes	No

7. Give two reasons, critical factors, incidents, or crises which you think may have caused the project to be adopted (or not adopted) by you, the Board, or the community. (Give reasons in order of importance.)

(1) ____

(2) ____

B. Characteristics of Project

8. During the term of this project, approximately how many persons were (or will be) served by the project? (Write the numbers opposite the type of area; then total the column.)

Number of persons

________________ (1) Large city (over 500,000)

________________ (2) Suburb of large city above

________________ (3) Rural area near a large city above

________________ (4) Middle-sized city (50,000-500,000)

________________ (5) Suburb of a middle-sized city above

________________ (6) Rural area near a middle-sized city above

________________ (7) Small city or town (less than 50,000)

________________ (8) Rural area, not near large or middle-sized city

________________ (9) Total served by this project (add column)

9. What will be the total amount of funds devoted to the project from inception to termination of the Federal project period?

$ ________________ (1) Title III, ESEA grant only (all years)

$ ________________ (2) Other Federal, State, or Foundation grants (all years)

$ ________________ (3) Local school system source (all years)

$ ________________ (4) Total of above

10. Approximately what percent of the total project budget reported above was devoted to training, orienting, or otherwise preparing personnel to perform the activities in the project?

________________%

11. Approximately what percent of the budget was devoted to dissemination activities (newsletters, TV, films, community meetings, brochures, tours, etc.)

______________________%

12. Approximately what percent of the budget was devoted to evaluation activities?

______________________%

13. Classify the innovation in your project according to the major program emphasis. (If more than one emphasis, rank in order of effort - 1, 2, 3, etc.)

____ (1) new course offering in the regular curriculum

____ (2) new use or retraining of teachers and other school-related personnel

____ (3) major reorganization of the school and/or curriculum

____ (4) supplementary and/or enrichment courses or activities

____ (5) new ways to achieve community understanding, participation, or racial or social integration

____ (6) new use of technology to reach more persons more efficiently

____ (7) new guidance, counseling and testing, and remedial services

____ (8) planning, evaluation, and dissemination services

____ (9) special education for the handicapped

14. Classify your project as to kinds of persons served (check all appropriate)

____ (1) elementary (K-8) pupils

____ (2) secondary (9-12) pupils

____ (3) other

15. Did the personnel listed below participate in the development of the project in such a manner so as to influence its content and operation? (Circle appropriate number)

(1) Students:	1 Yes	2 No	3 Don't know
(2) Teachers:	1 Yes	2 No	3 Don't know
(3) Principals:	1 Yes	2 No	3 Don't know
(4) Superintendent:	1 Yes	2 No	3 Don't know
(5) Parents, or other citizens:	1 Yes	2 No	3 Don't know
(6) School board:	1 Yes	2 No	3 Don't know

16. How much does the innovation cost per pupil? (Divide three-year cost of project by number of students served during that period.)

$ ________________

17. Are the outcomes of the innovation highly visible? (Circle number)

1 2
Yes No

18. Are the past experiences, training, and values of those who must implement the program (teachers, principals) compatible with the requirements of the new program? (Circle number)

1 2
Yes No

19. Are the concepts, the methodology, and/or materials in the program such that they can be easily understood by those who must implement them? (Circle number)

1	2
Yes	No

20. Can the program be operated without greatly disturbing the routines of personnel in the school system? (Circle number)

1	2
Yes	No

21. Can the results of the program be explained to others who must understand them in order to adopt the program? (Circle number)

1	2
Yes	No

C. Characteristics of the School System and Community

22. What is this year's average current expenditure per child in your school district(s)? Use A.D.M.

$ ____________________

23. How many pupils are currently enrolled in your school system(s), grades K-12? (A.D.M.)

____

24. What percent of the last three high school graduating classes has entered college? (Circle number)

1	2	3	4	5	6
0-10%	11-30%	31-50%	51-70%	71-90%	91-100%

25. Approximately what is the current average per family income of constituents in school district(s)? (Check bracket)

____ (1) Under $3,000

____ (2) Between $3,000-$5,000

____ (3) Between $5,000-$10,000

____ (4) Between $10,000-$15,000

____ (5) More than $15,000

26. How many of the last three superintendents were hired from outside the system? (Circle number on scale)

0 / 1 / 2 / 3

27. During the last ten years, how many of the innovations listed below have been tried in your district? (Check list; add; and circle number on the scale below which brackets your total.)

__Language Lab
__Chem Study
__Modern Math
__Paraprofessionals
__Student Aides
__Computers for Instruction
__Programmed Learning
__Extended School Year
__Extended Field Trips
__Bilingual Program
__Released or Shared Time
__Team Teaching
__Non Gradedness
__Flexible Scheduling
__I.T.A.

__F.L.E.S.
__PSC Physics
__Typing in Elementary
__Community School
__Work/Study Program
__Teacher Corps
__Student Exchange
__E.T.V.
__Independent Study
__Micro Teaching
__Teacher Exchange
__B.S.S.C.
__Others-specify
____
____

1	2	3	4	5	6
1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26+

28. On each of the following items, indicate about what percent of your recommendations are accepted by the Board of Education:

(1) Budget items (Circle number)

1	2	3
0-33%	34-66%	67-100%

(2) Personnel hired
(Circle number)

1	2	3
0-33%	34-66%	67-100%

(3) Construction decisions
(Circle number)

1	2	3
0-33%	34-66%	67-100%

(4) Curriculum changes
(Circle number)

1	2	3
0-33%	34-66%	67-100%

29. How would you rate your community regarding its receptivity to new ideas? (Circle number)

1	2
Usually cautious, conservative	Usually supportive, open-minded

D. Characteristics of the Superintendent

30. What is your present age? (Indicate below)

____

31. What is your sex? (Circle number)

1	2
Male	Female

32. What is your highest educational attainment to date? (Circle number)

1	2	3	4	5
Less than degree	Bachelors	Masters	At least 30 hours beyond Masters	Doctorate

33. How many years have you been a school superintendent? (Indicate below)

____

34. Do you consider yourself urban or rural by place of birth? (Circle number)

1	2	3	4
Rural (Farm)	Small town	Urban	Urban Big city

35. Excluding military service, how many times have you changed communities since you left college? (Circle number)

1	2	3	4	5
1-3 times	4-6 times	7-10 times	11-15 times	16+ times

36. How many educational meetings outside your state have you been to during the past three years? (Circle number that brackets your answer)

1	2	3	4	5
0	1-5	6-10	11-15	16+

37. Which statement below comes closest to describing your own attitude and behavior regarding educational innovations? (Check one)

____ (1) I am willing to try almost any new ideas even though I know that there are serious risks involved.

____ (2) I am willing to try an innovation if it has been tested in at least one place.

____ (3) I have reservations about some of today's innovations, but will try those that seem to be accepted.

____ (4) I sincerely feel that most of today's innovations are fads and that it is wise to wait before trying them myself.

____ (5) I sincerely believe that there is little need to innovate since we already know more about improving education than we can possibly do.

38. Do you regard yourself as being a liberal or a conservative in matters other than school program? (Circle number)

1	2
Liberal	Conservative

39. Which of the two categories below would you or do you go most often for reliable information about educational innovations? (Circle one)

1	2
Authoritative Written Source	Knowledgeable people
i.e.	i.e.
Libraries, ERIC, professional journals, and research bulletins	Superintendent(s), experts, university personnel, and teachers

Thank you.

Any comments? ____

____

____

APPENDIX D

TWENTY-EIGHT TITLE III PROJECTS RATED INNOVATIVE BY USOE

Project "Plato"
Ala., Anniston, City Board of Education
Project Number DPSC 66-2337

A computer will be used to provide a personalized learning program for each student, to perform routine clerical tasks usually performed by teachers, and to obtain immediate test-score data for research projects in such areas as dropouts, vocational success, and academic success. A vocational computer technology program will also be established to train students in key punch and programing. A projected achievement profile will be developed for each student. Comparative-progress evaluations will be made and a continuous-learning diagnosis will be provided. When a student shows proficiency on one level he will be allowed to progress to the next. If not, he will be scheduled into a skills-development lab situation where weaknesses will receive immediate attention. The lab will provide tutorial and computer-assisted instruction, programed materials, and small-group work. The computer can also be used for scheduling purposes and for inservice training of teachers. Approximately 4,010 elementary and secondary students from public and nonpublic schools will participate. For further information, contact Floyd McLeod, Administrative Assistant, 1429 Woodstock Ave., Anniston, Alabama 36201. (205) 326-4172.

Southeast Alaska Audio-Visual Center
Alaska, Juneau, Greater Juneau Borough School District
Project Number DPSC 66-896

A centrally located center will be established to unify all audiovisual services. The center will be used to provide (1) ample space for storage of equipment, (2) inservice training by sending an audiovisual coordinator to the various school districts, (3) use of minor maintenance services, (4) increased audiovisual materials, and (5) distribution services via an audiovisual mobile unit. Approximately 30,000 public and nonpublic school students and teachers will be served. For further information, contact John P. Gunnison, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, 1250 Glacier Ave., Juneau, Alaska 99801. (907) 586-1475.

Northern Arizona Supplementary Educational Center
Ariz., Flagstaff, School District 1 and H.S. District 1
Project Number DPSC 66-2356

A resource center will be established to serve students from a five-county area. The center will serve as a base for curriculum improvement, stressing the adoption of new programs and teaching strategies. Approximately 50 per cent of the students are classified as disadvantaged, including a number of American Indians. Objectives will be to improve pupil achievement, to improve attitudes of each student cultural group toward other groups, to reduce the incidence of psychological maladjustment, to increase communications on new programs, to increase the use of new media, and to increase the use of community resources. Services will be provided in the areas of curriculum methods and materials, audiovisual aids, reading, Indian education, psychology and guidance, speech problems, the teaching of English as a second language, school-home and school-public relations, testing, and disadvantaged youth. Special programs will be tested in individual schools in such areas as Indian education, developmental reading and oral English, cultural enrichment learning difficulties, inservice training, and the use of new teaching techniques. Approximately 41,366 elementary and secondary students from public and nonpublic schools will be served. For further information, contact John L. Gray, Coordinator of Visual Aids, Faculty Box 4088, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Arizona 86001. (602) 774-6611.

Program and Center for Educational Advancement
Ariz., Mesa, Elem. Sch. Dist. 4, High Sch. Dist. 207
Project Number DPSC 66-1284

A center for educational advancement will be planned to serve a number of public and private schools in an urban-rural area covering 10,000 square miles in three counties. The center will be designed to serve as both an information-gathering and a production ~~facility~~ facility to put research findings and proven innovations into practice. Specific services to be considered are inservice training, demonstrations of remedial techniques and new educational methods and materials, demonstrations of specialized instruction for emotional, psychological, and curriculum problems, cultural enrichment programs in music and art, consultant demonstration, and equipment centers. Approximately 48,000 elementary and secondary students are enrolled in area schools. It is estimated that one-tenth of them will be served directly by the proposed center. For further information, contact Dan Dearen, Acting Project Director, Mesa Public Schools, Mesa, Arizona 85201. (602) 969-1431.

Project To Initiate, Compare, and Evaluate Educational Approaches to the Problems of Children with Behavioral Disorders
Ariz., Tucson, School District #1
Project Number DPSC 66-972

A service center will be developed to coordinate educational, clinical, and research techniques to help emotionally disturbed children. Methods of diagnosis, treatment, and techniques of teaching will be explored and tried out. Several programs will be introduced, including a special day school, residential school, segregated special classrooms in elementary schools, a combination group and tutorial program, supportive teacher services, and recreational-therapy activities. Various educational approaches will be introduced, compared, and evaluated by a psychiatrist, psychologist, social worker, and teacher. The entire program will be pupil-family centered, stressing better emotional and behavioral adjustment. Approximately 25 preschool children and 300 elementary students will be served. For further information, contact Laura D. Ganoung, Supervisor of Education, School District 1, P.O. Box 4040, Tucson, Arizona 85717. (602) 791-6275.

PACE-Sim Visual Arts Project
Calif., San Bernardino, County Supt. of Schools
Project Number DPSC 66-1948

A visual arts project will provide a visual arts center, mobile vans or artmobiles, selected community art exhibits, and visiting-artist demonstrations for approximately 640,000 persons from three-counties. Selected art works will be shown at the art center and in individual schools. The exhibits, lectures, demonstrations, and art information will be dispersed to public and nonpublic schools and elsewhere in the communities. Objectives are to give students and adults a greater interest in and appreciation of the visual arts, to provide art students and teachers more knowledge of art, artists, materials, and methods, and to encourage community interest in a wider and long-range art program. Evaluation will be based on attendance at the exhibits and at public and school activities, the reaction of individuals who have viewed exhibits, and the operating records of the project itself. For further information, contact Wayne Dean, Coordinator of Art Education, San Bernardino County, Fifth Floor, Hall of Records, 172 West Third St., San Bernardino, California 92403. (714) 889-0111.

Arts and Humanities Education Program
Colo., Colorado Springs, City Schools
Project Number DPSC 66-2001

Arts and humanities will be incorporated into an existing K-12 curriculum through an extensive usage of community resources. The range of resources will include field trips, classroom exhibits, all school and community exhibits, individual resource people, and live performances in the areas of music, drama, and dance, educational media including books, films, slides, records, tapes, and art prints will be available. Teachers will be provided orientation and inservice training. Evaluation of the program will be based on statistical documentation showing the usage of resources and surveys to determine the program's effectiveness from the participants' points of view. Approximately 55,000 elementary and secondary students will be served. For further information, contact Don A. Green, Project Director, Title III ESEA, Palmer Hall, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colorado 80903. (303) 633-8773.

Program for the Education of Emotionally and Perceptually Handicapped Children
Colo., Fort Collins, Poudre School District R1
Project Number DPSC 66-45

Intensive educational and psychological services will be provided to emotionally and perceptually handicapped children with the goal of returning them to the regular school program. The clinically oriented program will include a day school for children who should not be in regular classes but who can perform acceptably in special groups and an itinerant-teacher program for children who would benefit from working with a special teacher in a very small group for part of the school day. There will also be a homebound program for children who cannot function in either of the above programs but who are not institutionalized. The team approach will involve the services of an administrator, a psychologist, a social worker, skilled teachers, the staff of a mental health clinic, and consultants from two colleges. Approximately 83 elementary students from public and nonpublic schools and 95 school staff members will participate. For further information, contact P. L. Schmelzer, Director of Instruction, 317 South College, Fort Collins, Colorado 80521. (303) 482-7420.

Exemplary Education for Early Childhood
Colo., Greeley, Weld County School District 6
Project Number DPSC 66-1997

An ungraded, self-pacing, and self-correcting program with an appropriate adult-pupil ratio will be established for preschool and primary age children. The program aims (1) to develop improved linguistic facility, problem-solving ability, and a positive self-image in the students, (2) to develop curricula which provide optimal means for learning, and (3) to conduct basic research in early childhood education. Inservice training will be provided teachers and teacher aides in the concept of an integrated preschool primary program. Approximately 1,540 public and nonpublic school children will participate in this program. For further information, contact Keith Blue, Weld County School District 6, 1416 Ninth Ave., Greeley, Colorado 80631. (303) 352-1543.

Study of Educational Programs for Elementary School Children
Involved in a Regional Desegregation Plan
Conn., Hartford, Board of Education
Project Number DPSC 66-2035

A desegregation program will be introduced. It will involve the random selection of approximately 896 children in grades K-8 of a predominately negro city school who will be transported to 14 communities (67 schools). This program aims to develop a cooperative structure between an inner-city and suburban communities to solve the educational problems related to racial imbalance. Supportive services available for transported children will include--(1) group and individual tutoring and consultation with classroom teachers, provided by a special teacher assigned to help the children, (2) the use of nonprofessional aides (one for each 25 children) who will be chosen from the neighborhoods of the transported children to work with teachers and ride on buses. For further information, contact Robert M. Kelly, Assistant Superintendent, 249 High St., Hartford, Connecticut 06115. (203) 527-4191.

Science Center (Pinellas County, Florida)
Fla., Clearwater, Pinellas County Bd. of Pub. Inst.
Project Number DPSC 66-870

Science programs provided by an existing science center, will be expanded to provide the opportunity for a greater number of scientifically oriented students from public and nonpublic schools to engage in individual research projects of their own choice. Talented children in grades 4-12 will be able to use the science center and also the services of adult science teachers, scientists, and technically skilled persons on an after-school, weekend, and summer basis. The professional and volunteer staffs of the center will be expanded and training workshops provided for them. The center now serves about 8,700 students. An additional 7,000 are expected to participate in the expanded program. For further information, contact J. Richard Thomson, 7701 22nd Ave. North, St. Petersburg, Florida 33518. (813) 342-8691.

Fernbank Science Center
Ga., Decatur, DeKalb County Board of Education
Project Number DPSC 66-1353

Fernbank Science Center represents an educational service center designed to provide, through innovative programs and services, a means for the further enhancement of scientific literacy and proficiency within the student, lay, and professional segments of our population. Its primary objectives are: (1) to improve, supplement and extend instructional opportunities in the sciences relative to existing preschool, elementary, secondary, and adult educational programs, (2) to stimulate, develop, and encourage constructive attitudes and activities conducive to the enrichment and extension of the current state of scientific understanding and appreciation common to society, (3) to provide programs, develop resources, and disseminate information relative to innovative and exemplary practices in science education pertinent to excellence in the teaching of the natural and physical sciences at all levels of instruction.

The following established resource areas enable the staff at Fernbank Science Center to fulfill the above objectives: 65 acres of primeval forest within an 80 acre tract, the third largest planetarium in the United States, the largest observatory in the Southeast, an electron microscope laboratory, a meteorology laboratory, student research laboratories, a greenhouse and a science reference library. Future plans include additional greenhouses, several acres of botanical gardens, a natural history museum, a large sea aquarium and an audio-visual center. For further information, contact Lewis S. Shelton, 156 Heaton Park Dr., Atlanta, Georgia 30307. (404) 378-4311.

Eighth Congressional District Honors Program
Ga., Douglas, Coffee County Board of Education
Project Number DPSC 66-1220

An 8-week summer residential honors program will be offered to 150 academically gifted and artistically talented students from 24 counties in a Congressional district. The students will have completed 10th or 11th grade. The program, located on a college campus, should provide enriched opportunities which may be otherwise unavailable. Instruction will be given in eight curricular areas--natural sciences, social sciences, mathematics, language arts, modern foreign languages, art, drama, and music. Students will major in one and minor in another of these areas, depending on ability, interest, and aptitude. All students will take part in physical education activities and in a discussion group. Course content will be idea centered, stressing the integration of knowledge. Exploratory experiences will also be offered in areas outside major interests, including seminars, concerts, plays, and a full recreational program. New curriculums and teaching methods will be used. The importance of cultural and aesthetic opportunities will be emphasized. The program should also benefit teachers, counselors, and administrators associated with the program, providing instructional experiences which can be used in regular classrooms during the school year. Follow-up activities include weekend seminars, college visits, cultural events, follow-through to college counseling, research on the gifted, education consulting with emphasis on inservice teacher training and school evaluation, and serves as a cultural and materials center. For further information, contact Lester M. Solomon, Director, South Georgia College, Douglas, Georgia 31533. (912) 334-1100.

Exemplary Individualized Learning Center
Idaho, Hagerman, Joint School District 233
Project Number DPSC 66-1385

An individualized learning center will include (1) an instructional materials center for the collection, storage, and dissemination of teaching and instructional materials, (2) a library center that will include written materials in all curricular areas, (3) individualized reading stations, (4) individualized study areas and listening stations, (5) a small-group audiovisual learning and seminar area, and (6) a television receiving station. The center will be developed to serve as a model for more than one-half of the secondary schools in a statewide area. Emphasis will be placed on obtaining and organizing materials that facilitate individualized learning opportunities. Approximately 8,500 secondary students will be served. For further information, contact George M. Carnie, Superintendent of Schools, P. O. Box 236, Hagerman, Idaho 83332. (208) 837-5472.

Elk Grove Training and Development Center
Ill., Elk Grove Village, Comm. Cons. Sch. Dist. 59
Project Number DPSC 66-2644

A Training and Development Center has been established to offer a variety of Demonstration and Training Programs to teachers, administrators, and specialists. Trainees have been directly involved in the ideas being demonstrated. Demonstrations have covered such ideas as an ungraded primary system, Learning Centers, Independent Study, Motor Facilitation, Elementary Fine Arts Center, Orff Music Program, Self Imposed Scheduling, Closed Circuit TV, Inservice Training in Affective Domain, Elementary Social Science, Mathematics and Science. Several other programs have been instituted in cooperation with nearby colleges. One has involved sending several teachers to a University Curriculum Center in English for Curriculum Study on a half-time basis. A second program consisted of using new materials developed by the Madison Project for use by students in grades 3-5 on a nongraded basis. In addition, a Leadership Training Program has been conducted at the Center by consultants and an evaluation team has conducted ongoing studies into the effectiveness of the training programs. Training in evaluation skills has also been available. About 1,000 staff members have been served from schools enrolling 69,000 students. For further information, contact Donald Thomas, Superintendent, Community Consolidated School District 59, P. O. Box 100, Elk Grove Village, Illinois 60007. (312) 437-1000.

Cooperative Project Among Teachers, Schools and Industry for
Continued Development of Means to Improve Learning
Ill., Oak Park, Oak Park-River Forest H.S. Dist. 200
Project Number DPSC 66-1917

A library-located instructional resource center will be established to electronically store vast amounts of information and make that information instantly retrievable for individual or small-group instruction. The center will be able to transmit audio and video programs, including slides, motion pictures, video tapes, and radio and television programs via a dial-select system. The system will be able to handle 224 master programs. Approximately 75 study carrels, numerous classrooms, and additional schools will be hooked up to the system, equipped with headsets and video units. Students will gain access to information by dialing the coded number of selected material. Approximately 13,900 elementary and secondary students from public and nonpublic schools will be served. For further information, contact Miss Lura E. Crawford, Head Librarian, Oak Park and River Forest High School, East Ave. and Ontario St., Oak Park, Illinois 60302. (312) 383-0700.

Exemplary Programs in Language Arts
Mich., Pontiac, Oakland County Schools
Project Number DPSC 66-984

Special language arts programs will be instituted in every school district in the county. Each program will be staffed by a person or persons specially trained to provide one or more of the following services for children of average ability who are behind in language arts--diagnosis, clinical remediation, speech improvement, and reading instruction. It is anticipated that between 10 and 20 per cent of the students will need the assistance. Selected teachers will be given 8 weeks of inservice training at a "graduate practicum" to improve language development programs, learn new instructional methods and diagnostic techniques, and acquire skills to work effectively with students. Five model programs have been developed and one or more will be used by each district. The five programs include learning improvement programs for grades K-3, 4-6, and 7-9, an extensive reading program for junior or senior high school students. Approximately 45 teachers will participate in the 8-week inservice program and 300 will attend orientation seminars. Between 500 and 3,000 students are expected to benefit the first year out of a total enrollment of 247,064 students. For further information, contact Dr. William J. Emerson, Superintendent, Oakland Schools, County Service Center, Campus Dr., Pontiac, Michigan 48053. (313) 335-4192.

Proposal for the Use of a Mobile Laboratory to Enrich and Expand the Science Program in the Schools of District 241, Freeborn County
Minn., Albert Lea, Indep. School District 241
Project Number DPSC 66-1057

A mobile laboratory will be purchased and equipped for use during the summer and school year to provide resources to study, photograph, and classify specimens fresh from the field. Two 40-foot mobile labs are to serve as the laboratory. A number of items will be purchased to equip them, such as an anemometer, a refracting telescope, binoculars, insect nets, chisels, compasses, hammers, and soil test kits. Team teaching and an inservice training program will be instituted. The program should provide tools and procedures for individual study of natural environments. Each student will have an individual and a group project to work on in geology or field ecology. All students taking the mobile laboratory course must have completed a basic summer science program first. Students will be selected on the basis of their interest and achievement in science. Approximately 7,302 students, grades K-12, from public and private schools and 28 teachers will be served. For further information, contact Charles D. Carpenter, Science Department Chairman, Central Junior High School, Albert Lea, Minnesota 56007. (507) 373-3911.

Pilot Supplementary Elementary Science Interpretive Program
N.J., Middletown, Bd. of Ed. of Township Sch. Dist.
Project Number DPSC 66-532

A model elementary classroom-laboratory at a state park will enable elementary students to study natural sciences in a field center. Two experienced and licensed teacher-naturalists will conduct the program and provide an inservice program for teachers. Through the cooperation of the state park and the office of conservation with the board of education, a field teaching station will be established to study geology, marine and terrestrial organisms, and ecology of a barrier beach. Representative fourth grades will visit the park 90 minutes each day for one week to study a unit consistent with the season. The program should serve students as an introduction for their year's study of the natural sciences. Orientation and followup procedures have been developed for teachers. Approximately 520 children and 30 adults are expected to participate. For further information, contact Richard Cole, 63 Tindall Rd., Middletown, New Jersey 07748. (201) 671-2205.

Center of Science and Industry
Ohio, Cincinnati, Bd. of Educ. City School District
Project Number DPSC 66-2041

A center of science and industry will be established and programs planned to serve students and adults in a metropolitan area. The center will serve as a teaching facility in the physical and biomedical sciences, engineering, and technology. It will also extend and enrich the curriculums of 340 schools and 6 colleges by offering exhibits and by involving educational, technical, and scientific resources of the community in a teaching environment. The center will provide (1) an inservice training program for science teachers in the new techniques of teaching science at all levels, (2) project rooms to enable pupils and adults to develop scientific hobbies in the fields of radio, electronics, space sciences, photography, and other sciences, (3) seminars for gifted students interested in science, (4) career guidance sessions for individuals or groups using community resource persons, (5) enrichment programs, and (6) a mobile science laboratory that will circulate throughout the area to introduce and demonstrate new developments and techniques to teachers and students. Approximately 231,779 pupils in grades K-12, 17,425 college students, and the general public will be served. For further information, contact Kenneth E. Vordenberg, Administrative Supervisor of Science, Secondary Schools, Cincinnati Public Schools, 608 East McMillan St., Cincinnati, Ohio 45206. (513) 221-6800.

Centennial Joint Schools Supplementary Educational Service Center
Pa., Warminster, Centennial Schools, Bucks County
Project Number DPSC 66-2439

A comprehensive elementary school with a special experience laboratory will be used to study the effect of total environmental control on children with various types of learning ability and in many learning situations. The laboratory will be circular and windowless and will provide for the intensification of the learning process through the use of perceptual and cognitive experiences. All walls of the laboratory will serve as projection screens, enabling the teacher to surround the child with a preplanned environment. Through the use of 4-way still and 5-way still and movie projections, total environmental visualization will place the child in the picture rather than making the child a spectator viewing the picture. Stereophonic sounds can be introduced from all angles of the room. Through these audio and visual effects variables which affect learning can be compared, eliminated, and limited. Flexible patterns of grouping and pupil placement will be used to provide for maximum mobility of individuals and groups. An inservice program will be instituted to acquaint teachers from other schools with the program. Approximately 1,600 educable and trainable mentally handicapped, physically handicapped, and academically talented children will be served. For further information, contact Charles R. Walker, Project Director/Building Principal, Centennial (Joint) Schools, Warminster, Pennsylvania 18974. (215) 672-1200.

New Shoreham Tele-Lecture Math Project
R.I., New Shoreham, School Committee
Project Number DPSC 66-418

Two mathematics teachers will instruct students on an island 65 miles away and 13 miles off the coast via amplified telephone and electrowriter. Because the community is almost inaccessible, more conventional means for modernizing mathematics instruction have not been practical. The students participating will talk with the teacher and whatever the teacher writes or draws will be projected on a screen in the island school. One teacher will instruct children in kindergarten and the first five grades and the other teacher, those in grades six through twelve. An evening class for parents and teachers is planned. Persons to participate are expected to number 91 children 80 adult education students, and 50 members of cultural and civic groups. For further information, contact Thomas McCabe, Superintendent of Schools, New Shoreham, Rhode Island 02807. (Block Island). (401) 466-2251.

Demonstration Library in the Elementary School
R.I., Warwick, School Department
Project Number DPSC 66-47

A library will be remodeled and expanded to meet standards set by the American Library Association. It will then be used as an inservice facility for the training of elementary school librarians, teachers, and administrators in a state. It will be located in an area with a high concentration of children from low-income families. Techniques of librarian-teacher teamwork required to make an elementary school library a truly effective instrument for instructional improvement will be demonstrated. Two full-time librarians will be used to build the library book collection and to establish close working relationships with teachers and visiting educators. Approximately 3,000 educators are expected to participate. For further information, contact Agnes Bulkley, Director of Library Project, 32 Cavalcade Blvd., Warwick, Rhode Island 02889. (401) 737-4677.

Pre-Primary Demonstration School
S.C., Sumter, School District 17
Project Number DPSC 66-1748

A preprimary demonstration school will be established to provide preschool experiences for deprived children, ages 3-5. The school will be used to field test the nursery-school research conducted by a nearby college and to demonstrate the effectiveness of the methods, materials, and program in teaching deprived children, predominantly negroes. Preservice training will be provided to student teachers. The school buildings have been designed to meet the needs of the children and for demonstration purposes. High school, college, and adult teacher aides will be used. A school social worker and psychologists will also be employed to work closely with pupils, parents, and teachers. Such variables as preprimary school experiences, alternative preschool experiences, deprivation, typical school district background, race, intelligence, and classroom adjustment and achievement will be used to evaluate the program. Approximately 136 preschool children will participate. For further information, contact L. C. McArthur, Jr., Superintendent, Sumter School District 17, 452 Broad St., Sumter, South Carolina 29150. (803) 773-7823.

Exemplary Center for Team Teaching
Utah, Ogden, Weber County Board of Education
Project Number DPSC 66-384

Opportunities to observe and discuss a variety of team teaching situations will be provided at a center. The center will disseminate information about team teaching and coordinate the continued development of team teaching programs and facilities, other team teaching programs will be visited. The center staff will collect materials on team teaching, provide educational services including internships for teachers and administrative personnel, and offer inservice training and participation in the instructional program of the local university. Approximately 205,652 elementary and secondary public and nonpublic school students, 200 school personnel, and 250 adult education students will be served. For further information, contact William R. Boren, Superintendent, Weber County School District, 1122 Washington Blvd., Ogden, Utah 84404. (801) 394-8873 Ext. 21.

Laboratory Center for Reading
Va., Newport News, City School Board
Project Number DPSC 66-148

A laboratory center for reading will be established in a central elementary school to provide a comprehensive communication skills program. It will include areas for individual testing, small-group instruction, parent-pupil interviews, offices, conferences, lounges, library books, and restrooms. Three classrooms will accommodate larger groups. All 8, 9, and 10 year old children in grades 3-5 will be given a preliminary screening by regular classroom teachers, three regular reading specialists, and additional specialists from the laboratory center. Students with reading difficulties will be referred to the center for further screening, diagnosis, and corrective and preventive instruction. Social-work services and auxiliary psychological and speech services will be provided. Inservice training for teachers will be available. The center will be open 12 months of the year during the after school and on Saturdays. Materials and equipment will be purchased with matching funds under Title III NDEA, and remodeling expenses will be paid through Title III funds. Approximately 2,800 children in public and nonpublic schools will be served. For further information, contact George J. McIntosh, Superintendent of Schools, Newport News Public Schools, 119 Main Street, Newport News, Virginia 23601. (703) 596-0213.

High School For One--A Systems Approach to Improve Curricula in Remote High Schools
Wash., Anatone, School District 310
Project Number DPSC 66-2254

The school district will work with a university to develop and field test learning systems in speech, math analysis, Spanish, physical science, shorthand and industrial arts in three rural high schools. After field testing, the systems will be modified or redesigned and demonstrated in six other rural high schools. The program will combine an instructional system, developed by university specialists and high school teachers. Such instructional materials as synchronized slides, and audio tapes, 8mm film loops, and short programed texts will be used and laboratory experiences will be offered. Approximately 1,200 secondary students will participate. For further information, contact Dr. Arnold M. Gallegos, Assistant Professor of Education, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington 99163. (509) 335-5012.

Diagnostic and Remedial Reading Clinic
W. Va., Charleston, Kanawha County Bd. of Educ.
Project Number DPSC 66-1195

A diagnostic and remedial reading clinic will be established to serve all students in the county who have reading difficulties. The clinic will also provide preservice and inservice training for teachers in the techniques of identifying and correcting reading problems. Clinic staff members will diagnose the nature of reading difficulties in children referred to the clinic. Remedial instruction will then be provided for students who require clinical treatment. Consultative services will be offered to classroom and/or corrective reading teachers for students who do not require clinical help. The clinic will be staffed with specially trained teachers, a psychologist, and a guidance specialist. Medical and psychiatric services will be available if needed. Two mobile units will be used by the staff members in cases where it is more convenient to do diagnostic and remedial work at schools rather than bringing students to the clinic.

Approximately 3,448 elementary and secondary students from public and nonpublic schools will be served. For further information, contact Walter F. Snyder, Superintendent of Schools, 200 Elizabeth St., Charleston, West Virginia 25311. (304) 346-0471.

APPENDIX E

ANALYSIS OF RURAL, URBAN, AND COMBINED PROJECTS BY SELECTED VARIABLES

TABLE 49

SOURCES OF FUNDS FOR CONTINUATION BY URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED CLASSIFICATIONS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Source of Funds	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Local education agency	53	55.8	90	50.9	49	45.0
Fees from pupils	9	9.5	16	9.0	2	1.8
Business/Industry	3	3.2	6	3.4	6	5.5
State education agency funds	15	15.8	26	14.7	22	20.2
Foundations	4	4.2	5	2.8	6	5.5
A new federal grant	7	7.3	17	9.6	12	11.0
Other	4	4.2	17	9.6	12	11.0
Totals	177	100.0	95	100.0	109	100.0

Chi Square $= 14.42$ $p < .30$ $C = .19$

TABLE 50

SUPERINTENDENTS RECOMMENDING CONTINUATION AND DISCONTINUATION BY URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED CLASSIFICATIONS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Superintendents Recommendations	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Continue	53	89.8	102	91.1	63	91.3
Discontinue	6	10.2	10	8.9	6	8.7
Totals	59	100.0	112	100.0	69	100.0

Chi Square $= .22$ $p < .90$ $C = 0.00$

TABLE 51

NUMBERS AND PER CENTS OF PROJECTS PRODUCING INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS BY URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED CLASSIFICATIONS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Projects produced instructional materials						
Yes	45	75.0	90	76.9	57	78.1
No	15	25.0	27	23.1	16	21.9
Totals	60	100.0	117	100.0	73	100.0

Chi Square $= 0.17$ $p < .95$ $C = .026$

TABLE 52

NUMBERS, PER CENTS AND MEANS OF PROJECTS WITH VARIOUS PERCENTAGES OF BUDGETS DEVOTED TO TRAINING BY URBAN, RURAL AND COMBINED CLASSIFICATIONS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Per cent of budget in ranges						
0	7	11.6	18	15.3	7	9.6
1 - 2	10	16.7	22	18.6	13	17.8
3 - 4	4	6.6	6	5.1	5	6.9
5 - 6	9	15.0	21	17.8	9	12.3
7 - 8	1	1.7	1	0.8	5	6.9
9 - 10	10	16.7	12	10.2	9	12.3
11 - 12	0	0.0	3	2.5	1	1.3
13 - 14	1	1.7	0	0.0	3	4.1
15 & over	18	30.0	35	29.7	21	28.8
Totals	60	100.0	118	100.0	73	100.0
Mean Per Cents	18.99		17.36		16.56	

Chi Square $= 66.71$ $p < .001$ $C = 0.48$

TABLE 53

NUMBERS, PER CENTS AND MEANS OF PROJECTS WITH VARIOUS PERCENTAGES OF BUDGETS DEVOTED TO DISSEMINATION BY URBAN, RURAL AND COMBINED CLASSIFICATIONS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Per cent of budget in ranges						
0	11	18.3	16	13.5	4	5.5
1 - 2	23	38.4	46	39.0	15	20.5
3 - 4	6	10.0	12	10.2	11	15.1
5 - 6	6	10.0	14	11.9	18	24.7
7 - 8	2	3.3	1	0.8	0	0.0
9 - 10	6	10.0	18	15.3	12	16.4
11 - 12	0	0.0	1	0.8	3	4.1
13 - 14	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.4
15 & over	6	10.0	10	8.5	9	12.3
Totals	60	100.0	118	100.0	73	100.0
Mean Per Cents	6.78		6.90		8.38	

Chi Square $= 52.6$ $p < .001$ $C = 0.43$

TABLE 54

NUMBERS, PER CENTS AND MEANS OF PROJECTS WITH VARIOUS PERCENTAGES OF BUDGETS DEVOTED TO EVALUATION BY URBAN, RURAL AND COMBINED CLASSIFICATIONS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Per cent of budget in ranges						
0	8	13.3	12	10.2	5	6.8
1 - 2	23	38.3	52	44.0	17	23.3
3 - 4	6	10.1	8	6.8	13	17.8
5 - 6	8	13.3	25	21.2	21	28.8
7 - 8	1	1.7	3	2.5	3	4.1
9 - 10	10	16.7	12	10.2	5	6.8
11 - 12	2	3.3	0	0.0	1	1.4
13 - 14	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.4
15 & over	2	3.3	6	5.1	7	9.6
Totals	60	100.0	118	100.0	73	100.0
Mean Per Cents	5.40		4.93		7.18	

Chi Square = 48.98 $p < .001$ C = 0.42

TABLE 55

MAJOR PROGRAM EMPHASIS OF PROJECTS BY URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED CLASSIFICATIONS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
New courses	5	7.8	7	5.6	6	8.3
Retraining, new use	11	17.2	15	12.0	9	12.5
Major reorganization	4	6.3	11	8.8	3	4.2
Supplementary Services	24	37.5	48	38.4	27	37.5
Community involvement	2	3.1	4	3.2	1	1.4
New use of technology	9	14.0	20	16.0	10	13.9
Guidance services	4	6.3	10	8.0	6	8.3
Planning, evaluation and dissemination	3	4.7	2	1.6	7	9.7
Special education	2	3.1	8	6.4	3	4.2
Totals	64	100.0	125	100.0	72	100.0

Chi Square $= 13.76$ $p < .70$ $C = 0.23$

TABLE 56

URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED CLASSIFICATIONS OF PROJECTS BY GRADE LEVEL, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Elementary (K - 8)	50	43.1	100	40.8	65	40.9
Secondary (9 - 12)	44	37.9	85	34.7	59	37.1
Other	22	19.0	60	24.5	35	22.0
Totals	116	100.0	245	100.0	159	100.0

Chi Square = 1.56 $p < .90$ C = .06

TABLE 57

NUMBERS AND PER CENTS OF PARTICIPATION IN PROJECT DEVELOPMENT BY SELECTED PERSONNEL IN THE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY BY URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED CLASSIFICATIONS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Students						
Yes	32	54.2	42	39.3	35	51.5
No	26	44.1	59	55.1	31	45.6
Don't know	1	1.7	6	5.6	2	2.9
Totals	59	100.0	107	100.0	68	100.0
Chi Square = 5.29		$p < .30$		C = 0.14		
Teachers						
Yes	57	95.0	107	91.5	70	97.2
No	3	5.0	10	8.5	2	2.8
Don't know	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals	60	100.0	117	100.0	72	100.0
Chi Square = 2.76		$p < .70$		C = 0.10		
Principals						
Yes	50	87.7	104	92.0	64	88.9
No	7	12.3	9	8.0	7	9.7
Don't know	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.4
Totals	57	100.0	113	100.0	72	100.0
Chi Square = 3.20		$p < .70$		C = 0.11		

TABLE 57 -- Continued

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Superintendent						
Yes	49	83.1	114	98.3	68	95.8
No	10	16.9	2	1.7	2	2.8
Don't know	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.4
Totals	59	100.0	116	100.0	71	100.0
Chi Square $=$ 20.84		$p < .001$		$C = 0.27$		
Parents or other citizens						
Yes	32	56.1	71	66.4	56	82.4
No	21	36.9	30	28.0	9	13.2
Don't know	4	7.0	6	5.6	3	4.4
Totals	57	100.0	107	100.0	68	100.0
Chi Square $=$ 10.66		$p < .05$		$C = 0.21$		
School board						
Yes	31	53.5	79	73.1	53	74.7
No	22	37.9	23	21.3	15	21.1
Don't know	5	8.6	6	5.6	3	4.2
Totals	58	100.0	108	100.0	71	100.0
Chi Square $=$ 8.55		$p < .10$		$C = 0.18$		

TABLE 58

NUMBERS, PER CENTS, AND MEANS OF PER PUPIL COST OF URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED CLASSIFICATIONS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Per pupil cost						
$ 1 - $25	26	46.4	46	40.7	40	60.6
26 - 100	12	21.4	36	31.9	11	16.7
101 - 200	5	8.9	11	9.7	5	7.6
201 - 300	3	5.4	5	4.4	2	3.0
301 - 500	2	3.6	5	4.4	2	3.0
501 - 700	1	1.8	1	0.9	5	7.6
701 - 900	4	7.1	2	1.8	0	0.0
901 & over	3	5.4	7	6.2	1	1.5
Totals	56	100.0	113	100.0	66	100.0
Means	149		180		104	

Chi Square = 28.55 $p < .02$ C = 0.33

TABLE 59

NUMBERS AND PER CENTS OF SUPERINTENDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED TRAITS OF PROJECT INNOVATIONS BY URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED CLASSIFICATIONS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Outcomes of innovation highly visible						
Yes	42	76.4	95	81.9	57	83.8
No	13	23.6	21	18.1	11	16.2
Totals	55	100.0	116	100.0	68	100.0
Chi Square = 1.18		$p < .70$		$C = 0.07$		
Compatibility						
Yes	51	91.1	97	84.3	53	75.7
No	5	8.9	18	15.7	17	24.3
Totals	56	100.0	115	100.0	70	100.0
Chi Square = 5.44		$p < .10$		$C = 0.14$		
Easily understood						
Yes	57	100.0	110	94.0	67	94.4
No	0	0.0	7	6.0	4	5.6
Totals	57	100.0	117	100.0	71	100.0
Chi Square = 3.50		$p < .20$		$C = 0.11$		
Divisibility						
Yes	53	91.4	99	85.3	66	93.0
No	5	8.6	17	14.7	5	7.0
Totals	58	100.0	116	100.0	71	100.0
Chi Square = 3.04		$p < .30$		$C = 0.11$		
Communicability						
Yes	56	100.0	115	100.0	70	98.6
No	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.4
Totals	56	100.0	115	100.0	71	100.0
Chi Square = 2.41		$p < .30$		$C = 0.09$		

TABLE 60

NUMBERS, PER CENTS, AND MEANS OF URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED CLASSIFICATIONS BY PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE CATEGORIES

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Per pupil expenditure						
$ 1 - $300	1	1.7	3	2.8	2	3.0
301 - 349	1	1.7	5	4.6	3	4.6
350 - 499	12	20.7	28	25.9	9	13.6
500 - 549	4	6.9	14	13.0	12	18.2
550 - 599	6	10.3	14	13.0	9	13.6
600 - 649	3	5.2	15	13.9	7	10.6
650 - 699	8	13.8	2	1.9	6	9.1
700 - 749	4	6.9	5	4.6	4	6.1
750 - 799	2	3.5	6	5.6	8	12.1
800 - 899	17	29.3	16	14.8	6	9.1
Totals	58	100.0	108	100.0	66	100.0
Means	592		668		601	

Chi Square = 30.25 $p \angle .05$ C = 0.34

TABLE 61

NUMBERS, PER CENTS, AND MEANS OF URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED CLASSIFICATIONS BY SIZE OF PUPIL ENROLLMENTS OF SINGLE SCHOOL DISTRICT PROJECTS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Enrollment						
1 - 999	11	24.4	51	78.5	10	33.3
1,000 - 3,999	20	44.5	13	20.0	11	36.7
4,000 - 6,999	9	20.0	1	1.5	3	10.0
7,000 - 9,999	3	6.7	0	0.0	3	10.0
10,000 - 12,999	2	4.4	0	0.0	2	6.7
13,000 - 15,999	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
16,000 - 18,999	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.3
19,000 & over	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals	45	100.0	65	100.0	30	100.0
Means	664		3,146		3,463	

Chi Square = 45.81 $p < .001$ C = 0.50

TABLE 62

NUMBERS, PER CENTS, AND MEANS OF URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED CLASSIFICATIONS BY SIZE OF PUPIL ENROLLMENTS IN MULTIPLE SCHOOL DISTRICTS PROJECTS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Enrollment						
1 - 9,999	11	78.6	47	97.9	22	56.4
10,000 - 19,999	2	14.3	0	0.0	11	28.2
20,000 - 29,999	0	0.0	1	2.1	4	10.3
30,000 - 39,999	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	5.1
40,000 - 49,999	1	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
50,000 & over	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals	14	100.0	48	100.0	39	100.0
Means	2,284		7,463		9,986	

Chi Square = 24.44 $p < .01$ C = 0.44

TABLE 63

NUMBERS AND PER CENTS OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATING CLASSES ENTERING COLLEGES BY URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED CLASSIFICATIONS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Percentage of Students entering colleges						
0 - 10	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
11 - 30	3	5.5	14	13.2	5	8.0
31 - 50	22	40.0	42	39.6	30	47.6
51 - 70	16	29.1	40	37.7	22	34.9
71 - 90	14	25.4	9	8.5	6	9.5
91 - 100	0	0.0	1	1.0	0	0.0
Totals	55	100.0	106	100.0	63	100.0

Chi Square = 13.73 $p < .10$ C = 0.24

TABLE 64

NUMBERS AND PER CENTS OF PROJECTS BY INCOME LEVELS OF CONSTITUENTS IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED CLASSIFICATIONS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Income levels						
Under $3,000	0	0.0	5	4.6	1	1.6
3,000 - 4,999	9	14.5	38	34.9	5	8.1
5,000 - 9,999	38	61.3	60	55.0	48	77.4
10,000 - 14,999	13	21.0	4	3.7	7	11.3
15,000 & over	2	3.2	2	1.8	1	1.6
Totals	62	100.0	109	100.0	62	100.0

Chi Square = 37.10 $p < .001$ C = 0.37

TABLE 65

NUMBERS AND PER CENTS OF PROJECTS BY SOURCE OF SUPERINTENDENTS BY URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED CLASSIFICATIONS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Of the last three superintendents, the number hired outside the system						
0	14	23.3	27	22.9	28	38.4
1	16	26.7	27	22.9	19	26.0
2	17	28.3	31	26.3	20	27.4
3	13	21.7	33	27.9	6	8.2
Totals	60	100.0	118	100.0	73	100.0

Chi Square $= 12.91$ $p \angle .05$ $C = 0.22$

TABLE 66

NUMBERS AND PER CENTS OF INNOVATIONS ATTEMPTED IN THE PAST BY URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED CLASSIFICATIONS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Number of innovations tried over last 10 years						
1 - 5	0	0.0	8	7.9	0	0.0
6 - 10	4	7.4	31	30.4	4	6.3
11 - 15	11	20.4	35	34.3	14	21.8
16 - 20	24	44.4	19	18.6	24	37.5
21 - 25	13	24.1	6	5.9	18	28.1
26 & over	2	3.7	3	2.9	4	6.3
Totals	54	100.0	102	100.0	64	100.0

Chi Square $=$ 52.16 $p < .001$ C $=$ .44

TABLE 67

PROPORTIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS' DECISIONS ACCEPTED BY BOARDS OF EDUCATION BY URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED CLASSIFICATIONS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Per cent of recommendations accepted by boards						
Budget items						
0 - 33	0	0.0	1	0.9	0	0.0
34 - 66	0	0.0	3	2.7	2	3.0
67 - 100	57	100.0	107	96.4	65	97.0
Totals	57	100.0	111	100.0	67	100.0
Chi Square = 2.78		$p < .70$		C = 0.10		
Personnel hired						
0 - 33	0	0.0	1	0.9	1	1.5
34 - 66	0	0.0	1	0.9	1	1.5
67 - 100	57	100.0	109	98.2	64	97.0
Totals	57	100.0	111	100.0	66	100.0
Chi Square = 1.68		$p < .80$		C = 0.08		
Construction decisions						
0 - 33	1	1.9	4	4.0	0	0.0
34 - 66	0	0.0	11	11.1	2	3.3
67 - 100	51	98.1	84	84.9	59	96.7
Totals	52	100.0	99	100.0	61	100.0
Chi Square = 11.57		$p < .05$		C = 0.22		
Curriculum change						
0 - 33	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
34 - 66	0	0.0	4	3.7	1	1.6
67 - 100	55	100.0	104	96.3	61	98.4
Totals	55	100.0	108	100.0	62	100.0
Chi Square = 2.44		$p < .70$		C = 0.10		

TABLE 68

NUMBERS AND PER CENTS OF SUPERINTENDENTS' PERCEPTION OF COMMUNITY RECEPTIVITY TO NEW IDEAS BY URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED CLASSIFICATIONS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Receptivity to new ideas						
Usually cautious, conservative	17	29.3	49	42.6	23	32.9
Usually supportive, open minded	41	70.7	66	57.4	47	67.1
Totals	58	100.0	115	100.0	70	100.0

Chi Square $=$ 2.47 $p \angle .30$ C $=$ 0.10

TABLE 69

URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS BY AGES OF THE SUPERINTENDENTS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Ages of the superintendents						
Under 30	0	0.0	1	0.9	1	1.5
30 - 34	2	3.6	5	4.4	0	0.0
35 - 39	2	3.6	14	12.4	2	2.9
40 - 44	9	16.4	22	19.5	7	10.1
45 - 49	11	20.0	27	23.9	16	23.2
50 - 54	13	23.6	16	14.2	11	15.9
55 - 59	9	16.4	18	15.9	20	29.0
60 & over	9	16.4	10	8.8	12	17.4
Totals	55	100.0	113	100.0	69	100.0

Chi Square $= 88.33$ $p < .001$ $C = 0.52$

TABLE 70

URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF THE SUPERINTENDENT, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Highest educational attainment						
Less than degree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Bachelors	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.9
Masters	6	11.1	37	32.2	8	11.4
Masters plus 30 hours	19	35.2	44	38.2	20	28.6
Doctorate	29	53.7	34	29.6	40	57.1
Totals	54	100.0	115	100.0	70	100.0

Chi Square = 27.7 $p < .001$ C = 0.32

TABLE 71

URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AS SUPERINTENDENT, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Years of experience						
None	7	11.7	8	6.8	7	9.6
1 - 4	18	30.0	32	27.1	14	19.2
5 - 9	5	8.3	27	22.9	12	16.4
10 - 14	8	13.3	24	20.3	20	27.4
15 - 19	10	16.7	10	8.5	5	6.9
20 & over	12	20.0	17	14.4	15	20.5
Totals	60	100.0	118	100.0	73	100.0

Chi Square $= 82.05$ $p < .001$ $C = 0.51$

TABLE 72

URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS BY PLACE OF BIRTH OF THE SUPERINTENDENTS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Place of birth						
Rural (farm)	16	29.1	54	47.4	26	37.7
Small town	21	38.2	45	39.5	23	33.3
Urban	15	27.3	10	8.8	14	20.3
Urban (big city)	3	5.4	5	4.3	6	8.7
Totals	55	100.0	114	100.0	69	100.0

Chi Square $=$ 13.72 $\quad$ $p < .05$ $\quad$ C $=$ 0.23

TABLE 73

URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS BY NUMBERS OF TIMES SUPERINTENDENTS CHANGED COMMUNITIES SINCE LEAVING COLLEGE, EXCLUDING MILITARY, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Number of times moved						
1 - 3	19	37.3	53	46.5	29	41.4
4 - 6	22	43.1	46	40.3	29	41.4
7 - 10	10	19.6	15	13.2	9	12.9
11 - 15	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.9
16 or more	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.4
Totals	51	100.0	114	100.0	70	100.0

Chi Square = 8.49 $p \angle .30$ C = 0.19

TABLE 74

URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS BY NUMBER OF MEETINGS ATTENDED BY SUPERINTENDENT OUTSIDE THE STATE DURING PAST THREE YEARS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Number of meetings						
None	2	3.6	8	7.0	1	1.4
1 - 5	16	29.1	45	39.1	25	35.7
6 - 10	19	34.6	36	31.3	23	32.9
11 - 15	5	9.1	15	13.0	12	17.1
16 & over	13	23.6	11	9.6	9	12.9
Totals	55	100.0	115	100.0	70	100.0

Chi Square $=$ 11.13 p $<$ .20 C $=$ 0.02

TABLE 75

URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS BY RESPONSES OF SUPERINTENDENTS ON ATTITUDES TOWARD EDUCATIONAL INNOVATIONS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Attitude toward innovations						
I am willing to try almost any new idea even though I know that there are serious risks involved	29	51.8	51	44.7	36	51.4
I am willing to try an innovation if it has been tested in at least one place	18	32.1	28	24.6	18	25.7
I have reservations about some of today's innovations but will try those that seem to be accepted	9	16.1	35	30.7	16	22.9
I sincerely feel that most of today's innovations are fads and that it is wise to wait before trying them myself	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
I sincerely believe that there is little need to innovate since we already know more about improving education than we can possibly do	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals	56	100.0	114	100.0	70	100.0

Chi Square $=$ 4.82 p $<$ .30 C $=$ 0.14

TABLE 76

URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS BY SUPERINTENDENTS' SELF-RATING AS LIBERAL OR CONSERVATIVE, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Superintendent's philosophy						
Liberal	36	73.5	71	62.8	37	59.7
Conservative	13	26.5	42	37.2	25	40.3
Totals	49	100.0	113	100.0	62	100.0

Chi Square $= 2.47$ p $\angle .30$ C $= 0.10$

TABLE 77

URBAN, RURAL, AND COMBINED DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS BY COMMUNICATION BEHAVIOR OF THE SUPERINTENDENTS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Responses	Urban		Rural		Combined	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Sources of information						
Authoritative written source	19	41.3	34	30.9	21	31.3
Knowledgeable people	27	58.7	76	69.1	46	68.7
Totals	46	100.0	110	100.0	67	100.0

Chi Square $= 1.72$ $p < .50$ $C = 0.08$

APPENDIX F

ANALYSIS OF LESS AND MOST INNOVATIVE PROJECTS BY SELECTED VARIABLES

TABLE 78

SOURCES OF CONTINUATION FUNDS BY MOST INNOVATIVE AND LESS INNOVATIVE PROJECTS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Local education agency	29	40.9	165	48.8
Fees from pupils	10	14.1	36	10.6
Business/Industry	4	5.6	12	3.6
State education agency funds	8	11.3	55	16.3
Foundations	6	8.4	11	3.2
A new federal grant	8	11.3	30	8.9
Other	6	8.4	29	8.6
Totals	71	100.0	338	100.0

Chi Square $= 7.27$ $p < .30$ $C = .13$

TABLE 79

INNOVATIVE PROJECT DISTRIBUTION BY KIND OF SUPERINTENDENTS' RECOMMENDATIONS ON CONTINUATION, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Superintendents Recommendations	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Continue	30	96.8	191	89.7
Discontinue	1	3.2	22	10.3
Totals	31	100.0	213	100.0

Chi Square $= 1.59$ $p < .30$ $C = 0.08$

TABLE 80

NUMBERS AND PER CENTS OF PROJECTS PRODUCING INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS BY MOST INNOVATIVE AND LESS INNOVATIVE CLASSIFICATIONS

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Projects producing instructional materials				
Yes	27	81.8	168	76.0
No	6	18.2	53	24.0
Totals	33	100.0	221	100.0

Chi Square $= .54$ $p < .50$ $C = .046$

TABLE 81

INNOVATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS WITH VARIOUS PERCENTAGES OF BUDGET DEVOTED TO TRAINING, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Per cent of budget in ranges				
0	1	3.0	33	14.9
1 - 2	6	18.2	39	17.6
3 - 4	2	6.1	13	5.8
5 - 6	6	18.2	33	14.9
7 - 8	0	0.0	7	3.1
9 - 10	3	9.1	29	13.1
11 - 12	0	0.0	4	1.8
13 - 14	0	0.0	4	1.8
15 & over	15	45.4	60	27.0
Totals	33	100.0	222	100.0
Mean Per Cents	23.12		17.28	

Chi Square $=$ 54.71 $p < .001$ $C = 0.44$

TABLE 82

INNOVATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS WITH VARIOUS PERCENTAGES OF BUDGET DEVOTED TO DISSEMINATION, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Per cent of budget in ranges				
0	5	15.2	29	13.1
1 - 2	7	21.2	77	34.7
3 - 4	6	18.2	23	10.4
5 - 6	8	24.2	30	13.5
7 - 8	2	6.1	1	0.4
9 - 10	4	12.1	32	14.4
11 - 12	0	0.0	4	1.8
13 - 14	0	0.0	1	0.4
15 & over	1	3.0	25	11.3
Totals	33	100.0	222	100.0
Mean Per Cents	5.57		7.0	

Chi Square $= 21.72$ $p < .01$ $C = 0.29$

TABLE 83

INNOVATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS WITH VARIOUS PERCENTAGES OF BUDGET DEVOTED TO EVALUATION, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Per cent of budget in ranges				
0	2	6.1	25	11.3
1 - 2	11	33.3	82	36.9
3 - 4	4	12.1	23	10.4
5 - 6	8	24.3	45	20.3
7 - 8	1	3.0	6	2.7
9 - 10	5	15.2	23	10.4
11 - 12	1	3.0	2	0.9
13 - 14	1	3.0	1	0.4
15 & over	0	0.0	15	6.7
Totals	33	100.0	222	100.0

Chi Square $=$ 11.37 $p < .20$ C $=$ 0.21

TABLE 84

INNOVATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS BY MAJOR EMPHASIS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
New course	2	6.1	15	6.4
Retraining, new use	6	18.2	32	13.8
Major reorganization	1	3.0	17	7.3
Supplementary services	13	39.4	87	37.5
Community involvement	1	3.0	6	2.6
New use of technology	5	15.2	34	14.7
Guidance services	1	3.0	19	8.2
Planning, evaluation and dissemination	1	3.0	12	5.2
Special education	3	9.1	10	4.3
Totals	33	100.0	232	100.0

Chi Square $=$ 2.62 $p < .98$ C $=$ .10

TABLE 85

INNOVATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS BY GRADE LEVEL, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Elementary (K - 8)	27	40.9	192	41.5
Secondary (9 - 12)	26	39.4	165	35.6
Other	13	19.7	106	22.9
Totals	66	100.0	463	100.0

Chi Square = 0.50 $p < .80$ C = 0.03

TABLE 86

INNOVATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS BY PARTICIPATION IN PROJECT DEVELOPMENT BY SELECTED PERSONNEL IN THE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Students				
Yes	15	46.9	95	46.1
No	17	53.1	102	49.5
Don't know	0	0.0	9	4.4
Totals	32	100.0	206	100.0
Chi Square $= 1.47$	$p \leq .50$		$C = 0.07$	
Teachers				
Yes	31	93.9	207	94.1
No	2	6.1	13	5.9
Don't know	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals	33	100.0	220	100.0
Chi Square $= 0$				
Principals				
Yes	27	87.1	194	90.7
No	4	12.9	19	8.9
Don't know	0	0.0	1	0.4
Totals	31	100.0	214	100.0
Chi Square $= 0.65$	$p \leq .80$		$C = 0.05$	

TABLE 86 -- Continued

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Superintendent				
Yes	29	90.6	205	94.5
No	3	9.4	11	5.1
Don't know	0	0.0	1	0.4
Totals	32	100.0	217	100.0
Chi Square = 1.11	p < .70		C = 0.06	
Parents or other citizens				
Yes	20	62.5	140	68.6
No	10	31.3	52	25.5
Don't know	2	6.2	12	5.9
Totals	32	100.0	204	100.0
Chi Square = 0.50	p < .80		C = 0.04	
School board				
Yes	21	65.6	143	68.8
No	11	34.4	51	24.5
Don't know	0	0.0	14	6.7
Totals	32	100.0	208	100.0
Chi Square = 3.23	p < .20		C = 0.11	

TABLE 87

NUMBERS, PER CENTS, AND MEANS OF PER PUPIL COST OF MOST AND LESS INNOVATIVE CLASSIFICATIONS

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Per pupil cost				
$1 - $25	12	38.7	101	49.1
26 - 100	6	19.3	53	25.7
101 - 200	3	9.7	19	9.2
201 - 300	2	6.5	8	3.9
301 - 500	2	6.5	7	3.4
501 - 700	1	3.2	6	2.9
701 - 900	1	3.2	5	2.4
901 & over	4	12.9	7	3.4
Totals	31	100.0	206	100.0
Means	$248		$128	

Chi Square $=$ 6.12 $p < .70$ $C = 0.16$

TABLE 88

INNOVATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS BY SUPERINTENDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED TRAITS, NUMBERS AND PER CENTS

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Outcomes of innovation highly visible				
Yes	29	87.9	169	80.5
No	4	12.1	41	19.5
Totals	33	100.0	210	100.0
Chi Square = 1.03	$p < .50$		$C = 0.06$	
Compatibility				
Yes	26	78.8	180	84.9
No	7	21.2	32	15.1
Totals	33	100.0	212	100.0
Chi Square = 0.79	$p < .50$		$C = 0.05$	
Easily understood				
Yes	31	93.9	207	95.8
No	2	6.1	9	4.2
Totals	33	100.0	216	100.0
Chi Square = 0.24	$p < .70$		$C = 0.0$	
Divisibility				
Yes	23	74.2	197	90.8
No	8	25.8	20	9.2
Totals	31	100.0	217	100.0
Chi Square = 7.45	$p < .01$		$C = 0.17$	
Communicability				
Yes	33	100.0	212	99.5
No	0	0.0	1	0.5
Totals	33	100.0	213	100.0
Chi Square = 0.15	$p < .70$		$C = 0.02$	

TABLE 89

NUMBERS, PER CENTS, AND MEANS OF PROJECTS BY MOST AND LESS INNOVATIVE CLASSIFICATIONS BY EXPENDITURE PER CHILD

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Per pupil expenditure				
$1 - $300	1	3.2	5	2.4
301 - 349	1	3.2	8	3.9
350 - 499	8	25.8	41	20.0
500 - 549	1	3.2	30	14.6
550 - 599	4	12.9	25	12.2
600 - 649	6	19.4	23	11.2
650 - 699	1	3.2	15	7.3
700 - 749	2	6.5	11	5.4
750 - 799	2	6.5	13	6.4
800 - 999	5	16.1	34	16.6
Totals	31	100.0	205	100.0
Means	$618		$612	

Chi Square $= 5.07$ $p < .90$ $C = 0.15$

TABLE 90

NUMBERS, PER CENTS, AND MEANS OF MOST AND LESS INNOVATIVE PROJECTS BY SIZE OF PUPIL ENROLLMENTS OF SINGLE SCHOOL DISTRICTS PROJECTS

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Enrollment				
1 - 999	7	29.2	66	55.9
1,000 - 3,999	12	50.0	32	27.1
4,000 - 6,999	3	12.5	10	8.5
7,000 - 9,999	2	8.3	5	4.2
10,000 - 12,999	0	0.0	4	3.4
13,000 - 15,999	0	0.0	0	0.0
16,000 - 18,999	0	0.0	1	0.9
19,000 & over	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals	24	100.0	118	100.0
Means	2,402		2,030	

Chi Square = 8.02 $p < .20$ C = 0.23

TABLE 91

NUMBERS, PER CENTS, AND MEANS OF MOST AND LESS INNOVATIVE PROJECTS BY SIZE OF PUPIL ENROLLMENTS OF MULTIPLE SCHOOL DISTRICTS PROJECTS

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Enrollment				
1 - 9,999	7	77.8	75	79.8
10,000 - 19,999	1	11.1	12	12.8
20,000 - 29,999	1	11.1	4	4.2
30,000 - 39,999	0	0.0	2	2.1
40,000 - 49,999	0	0.0	1	1.1
50,000 & over	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals	9	100.0	94	100.0
Means	8,266		5,765	

Chi Square = 0

TABLE 92

NUMBERS AND PER CENTS OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATING CLASSES ENTERING COLLEGES BY MOST AND LESS INNOVATIVE CLASSIFICATIONS

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Percentage of students entering colleges				
0 - 10	0	0.0	0	0.0
11 - 30	1	3.2	22	11.1
31 - 50	13	41.9	82	41.4
51 - 70	11	35.5	70	35.4
71 - 90	5	16.2	24	12.1
91 - 100	1	3.2	0	0.0
Totals	31	100.0	198	100.0

Chi Square $= 8.39$ $p < .20$ $C = 0.19$

TABLE 93

NUMBERS AND PER CENTS OF MOST AND LESS INNOVATIVE PROJECTS BY INCOME LEVELS OF CONSTITUTENTS IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Income levels				
Under $3,000	0	0.0	6	2.9
3,000 - 4,999	8	25.8	45	21.8
5,000 - 9,999	18	58.1	130	63.2
10,000 - 14,999	5	16.1	20	9.7
15,000 & over	0	0.0	5	2.4
Totals	31	100.0	206	100.0

Chi Square $=$ 3.01 $p < .70$ C $=$ 0.11

TABLE 94

NUMBERS AND PER CENTS OF MOST AND LESS INNOVATIVE PROJECTS BY SOURCE OF SUPERINTENDENTS

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Of the last three superintendents, the number hired outside the system				
0	8	24.2	64	28.8
1	5	15.2	57	25.7
2	10	30.3	58	26.1
3	10	30.3	43	19.4
Totals	33	100.0	222	100.0

Chi Square $=$ 3.05 $p < .50$ C $=$ 0.11

TABLE 95

NUMBERS AND PER CENTS OF INNOVATIONS ATTEMPTED IN THE PAST BY MOST AND LESS INNOVATIVE PROJECTS

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Number of innovations tried over last 10 years				
1 - 5	1	3.2	7	3.6
6 - 10	4	12.9	37	19.3
11 - 15	8	25.8	52	27.1
16 - 20	12	38.7	56	29.2
21 - 25	6	19.4	31	16.1
26 & over	0	0.0	9	4.7
Totals	31	100.0	192	100.0

Chi Square = 2.55 $p < .80$ C = 0.11

TABLE 96

PROPORTIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS' DECISIONS ACCEPTED BY BOARDS OF EDUCATION BY MOST AND LESS INNOVATIVE PROJECTS

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Per cent of recommendations accepted by boards				
Budget items				
0 - 33	1	3.0	1	0.5
34 - 66	2	6.1	4	1.9
67 - 100	30	90.9	201	97.6
Totals	33	100.0	206	100.0
Chi Square = 4.25	$p < .20$		$C = 0.13$	
Personnel hired				
0 - 33	0	0.0	2	1.0
34 - 66	0	0.0	2	1.0
67 - 100	31	100.0	202	98.0
Totals	31	100.0	206	100.0
Chi Square = 0.61	$p < .80$		$C = 0.05$	
Construction decisions				
0 - 33	0	0.0	5	2.7
34 - 66	1	3.4	13	7.0
67 - 100	28	96.6	168	90.3
Totals	29	100.0	186	100.0
Chi Square = 1.36	$p < .70$		$C = 0.08$	
Curriculum change				
0 - 33	0	0.0	0	0.0
34 - 66	2	6.5	4	2.0
67 - 100	29	93.5	193	98.0
Totals	31	100.0	197	100.0
Chi Square = 2.04	$p < .50$		$C = 0.09$	

TABLE 97

NUMBERS AND PER CENTS OF MOST AND LESS INNOVATIVE PROJECTS CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO SUPERINTENDENTS' PERCEPTION OF COMMUNITY RECEPTIVITY TO NEW IDEAS

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Receptivity to new ideas				
Usually Cautious, conservative	8	24.2	82	38.3
Usually supportive, open minded	25	75.8	132	61.7
Totals	33	100.0	214	100.0

Chi Square $= 2.44$ $p < .20$ $C = 0.09$

TABLE 98

NUMBERS AND PER CENTS OF MOST AND LESS INNOVATIVE PROJECTS BY AGES OF THE SUPERINTENDENTS

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Ages of the superintendents				
Under 30	0	0.0	2	1.0
30 - 34	1	3.2	7	3.3
35 - 39	4	12.9	14	6.7
40 - 44	5	16.1	34	16.2
45 - 49	4	12.9	51	24.3
50 - 54	5	16.1	36	17.1
55 - 59	11	35.6	35	16.6
60 & over	1	3.2	31	14.8
Totals	31	100.0	210	100.0

Chi Square = 42.29 $p < .001$ C = 0.38

TABLE 99

NUMBERS AND PER CENTS OF MOST AND LESS INNOVATIVE PROJECTS BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENTS OF THE SUPERINTENDENTS

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Highest educational attainment				
Less than degree	0	0.0	0	0.0
Bachelors	0	0.0	2	0.9
Masters	7	23.3	45	21.1
Masters plus 30 hours	8	26.7	77	36.2
Doctorate	15	50.0	89	41.8
Totals	30	100.0	213	100.0

Chi Square $=$ 1.43 $p < .90$ C $=$ 0.07

TABLE 100

NUMBERS AND PER CENTS OF MOST AND LESS INNOVATIVE PROJECTS BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AS SUPERINTENDENT

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Years of experience				
None	3	9.1	20	9.0
1 - 4	5	15.2	61	27.5
5 - 9	9	27.3	36	16.2
10 - 14	4	12.1	48	21.6
15 - 19	4	12.1	20	9.0
20 & over	8	24.2	37	16.7
Totals	33	100.0	222	100.0

Chi Square $=$ 38.26 $p < .001$ $C = 0.37$

TABLE 101

NUMBERS AND PER CENTS OF MOST AND LESS INNOVATIVE PROJECTS BY PLACE OF BIRTH OF THE SUPERINTENDENTS

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Place of birth				
Rural (farm)	7	22.6	89	41.6
Small town	17	54.8	72	33.6
Urban	5	16.1	37	17.3
Urban (big city)	2	6.5	16	7.5
Totals	31	100.0	214	100.0

Chi Square = 5.80 $p < .20$ C = 0.15

TABLE 102

NUMBERS AND PER CENTS OF MOST AND LESS INNOVATIVE PROJECTS BY NUMBER OF TIMES SUPERINTENDENT CHANGED COMMUNITIES SINCE LEAVING COLLEGE, EXCLUDING MILITARY

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Number of times moved				
1 - 3	12	38.7	92	44.2
4 - 6	12	38.7	84	40.4
7 - 10	6	19.4	30	14.4
11 - 15	1	3.2	2	1.0
16 or more	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals	31	100.0	208	100.0

Chi Square $= 3.22$ $p < .50$ $C = 0.11$

TABLE 103

NUMBERS AND PER CENTS OF MOST AND LESS INNOVATIVE PROJECTS BY NUMBER OF MEETINGS ATTENDED BY SUPERINTENDENT OUTSIDE THE STATE DURING PAST THREE YEARS

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Number of meetings				
None	0	0.0	12	5.6
1 - 5	6	19.4	81	38.0
6 - 10	10	32.2	69	32.4
11 - 15	7	22.6	25	11.8
16 & over	8	25.8	26	12.2
Totals	31	100.0	213	100.0

Chi Square $=$ 10.41 $p < .05$ C $=$ 0.20

u

TABLE 104

NUMBERS AND PER CENT OF MOST AND LESS INNOVATIVE PROJECTS BY RESPONSES OF SUPERINTENDENTS ON ATTITUDES TOWARD EDUCATIONAL INNOVATIONS

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Attitude toward innovations				
I am willing to try almost any new ideas even though I know that there are serious risks involved	18	56.2	98	46.2
I am willing to try an innovation if it has been tested in at least one place	11	34.4	56	26.4
I have reservations about some of today's innovations but will try those that seem to be accepted	3	9.4	58	27.4
I sincerely feel that most of today's innovations are fads and that it is wise to wait before trying them myself	0	0.0	0	0.0
I sincerely believe that there is little need to innovate since we already know more about improving education than we can possibly do	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals	32	100.0	212	100.0

Chi Square $= 4.82$ $p < .10$ $C = 0.13$

TABLE 105

NUMBERS AND PER CENTS OF MOST AND LESS INNOVATIVE PROJECTS BY SUPERINTENDENTS' SELF-RATING AS LIBERAL OR CONSERVATIVE

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Superintendent's philosophy				
Liberal	22	73.3	125	62.8
Conservative	8	26.7	74	37.2
Totals	30	100.0	199	100.0

Chi Square $=$ 1.25 $p < .30$ $C = 0.07$

TABLE 106

NUMBERS AND PER CENTS OF MOST AND LESS INNOVATIVE PROJECTS BY COMMUNICATION BEHAVIOR OF THE SUPERINTENDENTS

Responses	Innovative			
	Most		Less	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Sources of information				
Authoritative written source	10	34.5	66	33.3
Knowledgeable people	19	65.5	132	66.7
Totals	29	100.0	198	100.0

Chi Square $=$ 0.01 $p < .90$ $C = .008$